This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06914177 2

ZXFF
Foster

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION

ON

UNIVERSALISM

AND

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT,

BETWEEN

REV. B. F. FOSTER,

PASTOR OF FIRST UNIVERSALIST CHURCH, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,

AND

REV. J. H. LOZIER,

PASTOR OF ASBURY M. E. CHURCH, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

HELD AT

MORRISON'S OPERA HALL,

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,

On the evenings of July 1st, 3d, 5th, 8th, 10th and 12th, 1867.

INDIANAPOLIS:
PUBLISHED BY B. F. FOSTER.

1867.

DSW NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
744469 A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

INDIANAPOLIS:
INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL PRINT.
1867.

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

PREFACE.

In presenting to the public the Opera Hall Debate on Universalism and Endless Punishment, I desire to make a few statements that may not be out of place in the preface to the work. At the time of the discussion, no arrangements were made for a full publication of the same. Hence though the matter was suggested subsequently by Mr. Lozier, I did not suppose it possible to collect all the material necessary to render the discussion full and complete. Finding however at a later date, that the first three nights of the debate were taken down in full by a competent reporter, and that Mr. Lozier's speeches in the Journal on the last proposition, were made up from his own manuscripts; and believing, that with the aid of my own notes and references, we could approximate near a fair report, I communicated by letter with Mr. Lozier in response to one received from him, my desire for a personal consultation upon the subject. As he was absent from the city most of the time after I wtote him I failed to see him; but he knew *where to find me*, and had he been desirous of treating me fairly in the matter, he would have granted me an interview. In the meantime he put to press what purports to be the Opera Hall Debate—a pamphlet which does me great injustice, giving but a mere abreviation of my speeches, while professing to give his

WOR 20 JUN 34

own in full. Hence at the urgent solicitation of my friends, I concluded to issue the debate in book form. The first three nights of the discussion are compiled from the notes of C. W. Stagg, Esq., one of the best phonographers in the west. The last three from the report of the Journal, which was made up from Mr. Lozier's own manuscript, and from my own notes used on the occasion. So that Mr. Lozier is fully and fairly represented in the work. The difference in length between Mr. Lozier's speeches and my own, may be accounted for in part, from the fact that my delivery is more rapid than his, and on the first night he failed to occupy his full time, by ten minutes.

The discussion does not cover as much ground as I could have wished, owing to the limited time occupied on each evening, and yet I trust that the arguments presented will be found sufficiently full to induce a further inquiry on the part of all who may read its pages.

B. F. FOSTER.

From the Indianapolis Journal of September 24th, 1867.

A CARD.

In justice to Rev. Mr. Fester, and at his request, I desire to make the following statement:

I attended the debate between Messrs. Foster and Lozier, on the first three evenings, and thinking it possible that it might be desirable to give the discussion to the public, I took down, in phonographic short hand, a *verbatim* report of all the speeches delivered on those evenings, being the entire debate on the first proposition. The debate on the second proposition I did not attend. Mr. Foster applied to me two weeks since for that portion of the debate that was in my possession, and I sold him the whole, transcribed into long-hand manuscript. It is about *three times as long* as the corresponding portion of the debate published by Messrs. Downey & Brouse.

CHARLES W. STAGG.

PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE DISPUTANTS, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COLUMNS OF THE INDIANAPOLIS DAILY JOURNAL.

MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 6, 1867.

The pastors of the Evangelical churches in the city, and also resident Evangelical Ministers will please remember the meeting of the Indianapolis Evangelical Ministerial Association at the rooms of the Y. M. C. A., at three o'clock this afternoon.

J. H. LOZIER, *Secretary.*

INDIANAPOLIS, May 7, 1867.

To the Editors of the Journal:

I see by the *Journal*, of yesterday, that there is an invitation in its columns for all *Evangelical Ministers* to attend a meeting of the Ministerial Association in this city. Now I would respectfully ask what it takes to constitute an individual an Evangelical Minister. We have no account of any such ministers in the New Testament. An Evangelist in the Savior's time was one who was sound in the doctrines of the gospel. And such is the definition of the term in our best Dictionaries and Lexicons. But suppose a Catholic, Unitarian or Universalist were to make application for membership in the Ministerial Circle, would they be admitted? And yet all these

churches found their doctrines upon the precepts and teachings of Christ, and accept his gospel as the foundation of their faith in a future existence. Can you give us any light on the subject of our inquiry? UNIVERSALIST.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 7, 1867.

MR. EDITOR:—In reply to a communication, signed "Universalist," I take pleasure in stating that any minister of this city, who can, in good faith, sign the articles of association, can become a member of the Ministerial Association of this city. These articles are in possession of Mr. Lozier, Secretary of the Association, who will, no doubt, take pleasure in showing them to "Universalist." They are, in substance, the same as the articles of the Evangelical Alliance of Europe and America. J. H. W. T.

President *pro tem* of Min. Association.

THE MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 8, 1867.

A communication appears in the *Journal* of Tuesday alluding to a call, published by myself as Secretary, for the assembling of the Evangelical ministers of the city, at the regular monthly meeting of our Ministerial Association. Your correspondent desires some "light" as to "what it takes to constitute an individual an Evangelical minister." If it is convenient for you to publish the following extract from our Constitution, you may render your correspondent an invaluable service:

DOCTRINAL BASIS OF UNION.

We propose no new creed; but taking broad, historical and Evangelical Catholic grounds, we solemnly re-affirm and profess our faith in all the doctrines of the inspired word of God, and in the *consensus* of doctrines as held by all true Christians from the beginning And we do more especially affirm our belief in the Divine human person, and atoning work of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, as the only sufficient source of

salvation; as the heart and soul of Christianity, and as the centre of all true Christian union and fellowship. Therefore, with this explanation, and in the spirit of a just Christian liberality in regard to the minor differences of theological schools and religious denominations, we also adopt as a summary of the consensus of the various evangelical Confessions of Faith, the articles and explanatory statements, set forth and agreed on by the Evangelical Alliance at its formation in London, September, 1846, and approved by the separate European and American organizations: which articles are as follows:

1. The Divine Inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures.

2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

3. The Unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of the persons therein.

4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the Fall.

5. The incarnation of the Son of God. His work of atonement for the sins of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign.

6. The justification of the sinner by faith alone.

7. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteonsness, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and the perpetuity of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper; it being, however, distinctly declared that this brief summary is not to be regarded, in any formal or ecclesiastical sense, as a creed or confession, nor the adoption of it as involving an assumption of the right authoritatively to define the limits of Christian brotherhood, but simply as an indication of the class of persons whom it is desirable to embrace within this Association; nevertheless we do cordially approve all the doctrines herein set forth, and sub-

scribe thereunto in good faith, without any mental reservation.

To the above doctrinal basis of union the following ministers of the city have already subscribed, and others have signified their purpose to do so at the earliest opportunity: N. A. Hyde, John Crozier, J. C. Smith, A. S. Kinnan, Charles H. Marshall, John A. Brouse, J. H. W. Stuckenburg, W. McK. Hester, George C. Heckman, Hanford A. Edson, John Scott, Elijah Whitten, Gilbert Small, Henry Wright, J. V. R. Miller, William Armstrong, Henry Day, Herman Quinius and the undersigned. We accept the definition of "An Evangelist" given by "Universalist"—viz: "one sound in the doctrines of the gospel," but possibly we may differ as to what constitutes "soundness" in these doctrines. The above articles indicate what we believe to be the *essential elements* of christianity. If "Universalist" or any minister of the denominations named by him, will subscribe to these articles, he can become a member

JOHN HOGARTH LOZIER,
Secretary I. E. M. A.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 10, 1867.

To Rev. J. H. Lozier, Secretary I. E. M. A.

DEAR SIR:—In your reply to the communication of "Universalist," you present us with the Articles of Association of the Evangelical Alliance formed in London, in September 1846, and say "that if Universalist or any Minister of the denomination named by him will subscribe to these articles, he can become a member." Without wishing to enter into any newspaper controversy respecting the merits of the doctrines embodied in the articles referred to, I may be permitted to say that so far as my own and the Unitarian denomination are concerned, the doors of the Association are forever closed. Embodied in these Articles are the doctrines of the Trinity, total depravity, and endless punishment, all of which doctrines we reject as unreasonable and anti-Scriptural. The only test required under the gospel dispensation, in order to constitute one a disciple of Christ, was faith in the Lord Jesus, and a practice of his precepts and teachings. When the jailor propounded

the question to Paul and Silas, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" the answer was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." He was not required to assent to any of the doctrines specified in the "Articles of Association" adopted by the Ministerial Circle. Hence we regard the test proposed by Paul and Silas as constituting one an *evangelical Christian*. The work of Christianity is positive and not negative, and consists in *acts*, and not simply *professions*. And we would be glad to co-operate with any body of men in doing good in the name of God and a common humanity. And we trust the day is not far distant when creeds will be forgotten, and sectarianism become obsolete; when men will unite upon the broad basis established by Christ and his Apostles.

Before closing, as you have in your pulpit ministrations and otherwise, seen fit to criticise somewhat severely my peculiar form of faith, you will permit me to invite you to a public investigation of its claims as a reasonable and scriptural system. For this purpose, I would propose a public discussion of four days, or six evenings, and would submit for your consideration the following questions:

1st. Do the scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?

2d. Do the scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the endless punishment of any part of the human family?

These questions will embody all the differences that exist between the theology of our respective denominations.

Hoping to hear from you at an early day, I am, as ever,

Yours truly, B. F. FOSTER.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 11, 1867.

To B. F. Foster, Pastor First Universalist Congregation, Indianapolis:

DEAR SIR:—In your communication in the *Journal* of Friday, May 10th, after alluding to the "Articles of Association" of the Ministerial Association, of which I have the honor to be the Secretary, you invite me to a public discussion of two propositions, viz:

1st. Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?

2d. Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the endless punishment of any part of the human family?

Your invitation is respectfully accepted.

I believe, that by the usages common to such discussions, the challenged party determines certain details, not specified in the challenge. We will discuss these questions as you suggest, for six evenings—Monday, Wednesday and Friday evenings—of two consecutive weeks, which I will name when these details are agreed to. The discussion shall be held in some commodious church in this city, and shall be opened on each evening with the Lord's Prayer, and closed with the Benediction with which the Scriptures conclude. The debate shall proceed as follows:

Each question shall occupy three evenings in the order named, on the first and second of which the affirmative and negative shall each be entitled to fifty minutes; and on the third evening the affirmative shall have thirty minutes to open, and twenty minutes to close after the negative. The definition of all controverted words and expressions, to be determined by the standard Lexicons, such as are used in our State University. Moderators to be chosen in the usual method.

You remark, at the conclusion of your note, that you think the above questions involve all the points of difference between our respective denominations. I am unable to see anything in either of those questions involving the doctrine of the *Trinity* which you deny in the beginning of your note.

Respectfully, JOHN HOGARTH LOZIER.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 12, 1867.

To Rev. J. H. Lozier, Pastor Asbury Chapel, Indianapolis:

DEAR SIR:—Your communication in the *Journal* of May 11th, is before me. The evenings you suggest, as well as the opening prayer and closing benediction each evening of the discussion, meets with my cordial approval. As to the time consumed on each evening, you will allow me to suggest two hours, beginning at precisely eight o'clock; each disputant oc-

cupying thirty minutes alternately. On the third evening of each proposition, the affirmant to have a closing speech of twenty minutes. And for the purpose of presenting the matter in a tangible form, I would submit for your consideration the following rules, in part already agreed to in your communication, and in substance those usually adopted in theological discussions:

1. The debate shall be held on Monday, Wednesday and Friday evenings of each week, for two consecutive weeks, beginning on Monday, May ———.

2. Each disputant shall select one Moderator, and these two shall select a third, who shall constitute a Board of Moderators, who shall preside over the debate, and see that the rules are observed, as well as perform such other duties as usually devolve upon Moderators.

3. The disputants shall occupy one half hour alternately, the debate beginning at eight o'clock and closing at ten o'clock. On the third evening the affirmant on each proposition shall be entitled to a closing speech of twenty minutes, but no new matter shall be introduced by the negative in the closing speech

4. The debate shall be opened each evening with the Lord's Prayer, and closed with the benediction of the New Testament by persons selected by the Moderators.

5. The books introduced into the debate by either disputant, shall be free for the use and inspection of the other.

6. The disputants are not to indulge in any personal reflections towards each other; but shall treat each other with respect and courtesy.

7. Neither disputant shall interrupt the other while speaking, except for the purpose of correcting any misapprehension of what he has said, or for explanation.

8. The questions for discussion shall be as follows:

1st. Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?

Mr. Foster affirms.

2d. Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the endless punishment of any part of the human family?

Mr. Lozier affirms.

I do not offer the foregoing rules because I am tenacious for their adoption, but simply as indicating what would be a fair and correct basis for a theological discussion.

As to authorities our appeal must be to the Scriptures and reason, though the standard lexicons will doubtless be used by both parties in determining the meaning of original words.

Believing that we shall have no difficulty in arranging the preliminaries, I shall select a Moderator, trusting that you will do the same—and would suggest a meeting of all the parties one evening this week, at such place as you may designate, to make the final arrangements for the discussion.

Respectfully yours, B. F. FOSTER.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 13, 1867.

To B. F. Foster, Pastor First Universalist Congregation Indianapolis:

DEAR SIR:—In response to your communication of yesterday, I have to say that I am glad that you say you are not tenacious for the adoption of the rules you suggest for the government of the proposed discussion. I believe it is not customary for those who give the challenge, and who propose the questions to be debated, to insist upon prescribing the time and mode and other details of the discussion. I am the more happy to learn that you will not press your views, because of the necessity I am under of insisting upon those expressed in my communication of Saturday, as to the following points: First, each disputant shall make but one speech upon the same evening (except as indicated by you in rule seventh), until the last evening for the discussion of each point, when the affirmant shall have twenty minutes to conclude the debate. As to the *length* of time each shall speak I am not very particular. I named fifty minutes as the limit, out of consideration for our auditors. My objection to alternating every thirty minutes is this: such a course involves needless confusion, and assumes more the semblance of a personal dispute than of a deliberate argument before a deliberative people. The other point upon which I insist is that "the definition of all controverted words and expressions introduced in the debate shall be determined

by the standard lexicons, such as are used in our State University." My reason for insisting upon this is obvious: I am satisfied of my own inability to *improve* upon our standard lexicographers to an extent that would induce my hearers to abandon them and follow me; and I would submit that whatever may be your abilities in this respect, it would be ungenerous in you to lead me beyond *the sight of our auditors*, into the depths of the Syriac, Arabic, Persic, Hebraic and Chaldaic, and "drown" me there all alone. I would rather keep in sight of the people who are to judge between us.

As I remarked in a former note, I will name the time when I shall be ready to enter upon this discussion, as soon as these preliminaries are settled.

Respectfully, JOHN HOGARTH LOZIER.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 14, 1867.

To Rev. J. H. Lozier, Pastor Asbury Chapel, Indianapolis:

DEAR SIR:—Yours of May 13th is before me, its contents noted, and I reply as follows:

While it is usual for the challenged party to propose the main features of the discussion, it is also customary that mutual concessions and agreements should be made in arranging the details of the same. But as you are tenacious upon the subject, and insist upon having everything your own way, I am disposed to gratify you in this respect. While I am opposed to making human authorities the standard of appeal in questions involving the destiny of immortal beings, I am nevertheless disposed to grant you all the prestige there is in favor of your doctrine, in the definition of words and phrases as given in the standard lexicons of the universities.

The rules I suggested are, in substance, those adopted in all the theological controversies of which I have any knowledge; and it is the first time that a disputant has been disposed to make human authority the basis of a decision involving the ultimate destiny of human beings.

You will understand me then as acceding to the terms of your communication of May 11th. You will, therefore, please

name the time when the discussion is to begin, as well as suggest a time to arrange all the necessary preliminaries for the same. Respectfully yours,

B. F. FOSTER.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 15, 1867.

To B. F. Foster, Pastor First Universalist Congregation, Indianapolis:

DEAR SIR:—In response to yours of the 14th, I will name Monday evening, July 1st, as the time when, Providence permitting, I shall be in readiness to begin the proposed discussion. I shall have no two consecutive weeks of leisure before that time, owing to other invitations and engagements that will require my presence and engross my time here, and at various points distant from the city, up to that time.

You say I "insist upon having everything my own way." In your challenge you gave the precise wording of the questions for discussion. In the second note you presented seven "rules" which you desired should govern our discussion; and now, because I insist upon adhering to two points previously named by myself, you seem a little fretted. A looker on might fancy that that "shoe" would best fit the "other foot;" but the other foot does not need it. Your talk about settling these questions by "human authority" sounds rather superfluous after one reads my proposition carefully.

When I find time for a meeting to make final arrangements I will drop you a note.

Respectfully, JOHN HOGARTH LOZIER.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 16, 1867.

To Rev. J. H. Lozier, Pastor Asbury Chapel, Indianapolis:

DEAR SIR:—The time named in your communication of yesterday, occurs during the hottest part of the season, as well as the shortest evenings. Besides it is holiday week, and would not likely be a desirable time to begin a discussion. As the question of human destiny is one paramount to all others,

I trust you may be able to postpone other engagements and meet me at an earlier date. If you cannot do so, the Lord willing, I will meet you at the time named in your communication. Trusting that a kind Providence will watch over us and direct the pending investigation in such manner as shall best subserve the interests of truth, I am, as ever,

Recpectfully yours, B. F. FOSTER.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 17, 1867.

To Rev. B. F. Foster, Pastor First Universalist Church, Indianapolis:

DEAR SIR:—In response to yours of the 16th, let me say that it would gratify both myself and a number of my friends, if this debate could occur at an earlier day, but during the last week of this month, Providence permitting, I shall be in attendance at the Sabbath School Convention of my Conference at Greensburgh. During the first week in June, I shall be at the State Sabbath School Convention at Lafayette. During the second week, I shall be in attendance upon the Grand Camp of the Host of Temperance in this city. During the third week I am to deliver an address before one of the Literary Societies at the Commencement of the Ohio State University, and during the fourth week I am to attend the Commencement Exercises of the Asbury University, being one of the Board of Visitors. So you see I can begin no sooner. You object to July 1st, it being a "holiday season." If you think it will not damage your cause to postpone, I will postpone it two weeks, or until any other suitable time, provided it will not interfere with my church meetings. As to the "hot weather," we can obviate any bad effects thereof by *keeping cool* ourselves, and counseling our hearers to follow our example. If a July heat has any terrors for mankind, what a sorry time is ahead of those who shall land in the place to which allusion is made in Revelations, twentieth chapter, tenth and fifteenth verses—"Where the beast and the FALSE PROPHET" are to test the question that some people in this world try to hoodwink their

fellow beings about! For my part, I intend not only to avoid that locality, but shall teach others to do so, the Lord being my helper. Respectfully yours,

JOHN HOGARTH LOZIER.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 18, 1867.

To Rev. J. H. Lozier, Pastor Asbury Chapel, Indianapolis:

DEAR SIR:—Let it be understood, then, that we shall meet, Providence permitting, on the first Monday in July, as I am opposed to any later postponement of the discussion. As to the *lake of fire* alluded to in your communication, it will be time enough to determine its location and temperature when we meet in July. As I have already intimated, I had no design, when I wrote my first letter, of entering into a newspaper controversy on the subject. You will, therefore, pardon me for not attempting a criticism upon the latter part of your epistle. Respectfully yours,

B. F. FOSTER.

RULES OF DEBATE

AGREED UPON BETWEEN THE PARTIES.

Rev. B. F. Foster and Rev. J. H. Lozier hereby agree upon the following rules and regulations, by which they are to be governed in the discussion of the theological questions hereinafter stated:

1st. The discussion shall be under the direction of three Moderators, one to be chosen by each party, and the third by the two so selected.

2d. Mr. Foster selects Eben W. Kimball, Esq., Mr. Lozier selects William H. Hay, Esq.; and Messrs. Kimball and Hay select Judge Solomon Blair, of the Marion Court of Common Pleas, as Chairman of the Board of Moderators.

3d. The discussion shall be held in Morrison's Opera Hall, upon Monday, Wednesday and Friday evenings, July 1st, 3d, 5th, 8th, 10th and 12th, and shall commence each evening promptly at eight o'clock.

4th. The questions for discussion shall be:

First. Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?

Mr. Foster affirms.

Second. Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the endless punishment of any part of the human family?

Mr. Lozier affirms.

5th. The discussion shall continue for three evenings upon each question. Upon Monday, July first, Mr. Foster will speak for fifty minutes, and be followed by Mr. Lozier for the same time. Upon Wednesday, July third, the same order and time will be allowed. Upon Friday, July fifth, Mr. Foster will speak thirty minutes, Mr. Lozier fifty minutes, and Mr. Foster twenty minutes in reply. Upon Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, July 8th, 10th and 12th, the same course will be adopted, and the same time allowed, only Mr. Lozier shall have the opening each evening, and on the last, the reply.

6th. The debate shall be opened every evening with the Lord's Prayer, and be closed with the benediction of the New Testament, by persons selected by the Moderators.

7th. The books introduced into the debate by either disputant shall be free for the use and inspection of the other.

8th. The definition of all controverted words and expressions, shall be determined by the Standard Lexicons, such as are used in our State University.

9th. The disputants shall not indulge in any personal reflections toward each other, but shall treat each other with respect and courtesy.

10th. Neither disputant shall interrupt the other while speaking, except for the purpose of correcting any misapprehension of what he has said, or for explanation, or to call the other to order. Such interruptions shall not exceed five minutes.

11th. No manifestation of applause or dissent shall be indulged in by the audience.

12th. There will be no vote taken upon the merits of the discussion.

13th. The Moderators shall enforce the foregoing rules and regulations.

B. F. FOSTER,
J. H. LOZIER.

FIRST NIGHT.

PROPOSITION. Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?

MR. FOSTER'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

RESPECTED AUDITORS:

Under the blessings of a kind Providence, we have assembled for the investigation of one of the most thrilling and interesting subjects that can possibly engage the attention of human beings—a subject involving the destiny of a world of immortals!

When we look at man, and see how "fearfully and wonderfully he is made," and witness the astonishing powers and capacities of his mind, we realize somewhat the importance of the subject involving his future and final destiny. And I confess that I approach the threshold of this investigation with feelings of profound awe, and fully realize the weakness and inadequacy of my powers to do it that justice which its magnitude would seem to demand; and I humbly invoke the aid of the Divine Being in my labors upon this occasion.

I have not the vanity to suppose that I shall succeed in convincing this vast assembly of the truth of my doctrine—or that I shall be able, in the course of this discussion, to remove all the prejudice that has been brought to bear upon my sentiments; and yet I fondly trust and believe that I shall be able to impress your minds in such manner, that you will be led to look more charitably upon us as a denomination, and be willing to grant, that if we are not *evangelical*, that we still belong to the same common family, and are tenderly cared for by the same loving and kind Father!

Were this earth our abiding place—were our pathway continually strewn with flowers of happiness and peace—did the current of life flow smoothly on at all times, there might be a plea for indifference to questions affecting our future destiny. But when the stern realities of life open upon us—when we awake to a consciousness of the fact that "we are passing away"—that here we have no "continuing city"—that "our days are spent as a tale that is told"—that time, in its hurried march, is fast bearing us to the shadowy future—how big with moment becomes the question, "Whither? ah! whither are we going?" To the land of the blest, the home of our loved ones—the dwelling place of the "spirits of the just made perfect"—where sin, disease and death are unknown? Or is this spirit, created in the image of its Maker,

to be banished forever from his presence, to dwell eternally in regions of woe unutterable, and miseries indescribable? Before this question, all others sink into insignificance.

And it is with no small degree of pleasure that I enter upon the work before me, from the fact that I am to defend a doctrine that is congenial with all the better feelings of the human heart—that has formed a conspicuous part in the prayers of the good, wise and pious in all ages of the world. A doctrine which meets with a cordial response from every holy impulse of the soul. It is a pleasing task that I am permitted to stand before you as the advocate of God's universal and impartial love and goodness, and to present the fullness of that love in its consummation through Christ, as the Savior of the world! To point you through the promises and purposes of God, to the time when the last erring wanderer of humanity shall be reclaimed, and God himself be "all in all!"

And I confess, my friends, that in one respect, at least, I have an advantage over my opponent, who is shortly to follow me. While he may contend with all the eloquence of which he is master, and with all the powers of a well disciplined mind, for the negative of the proposition, yet he desires from the very bottom of his heart that it may prove true—nay, it is the burden of his prayers that *all may be saved*, and come to the knowledge of the truth! Thus, while his head and creed may

be against us, his heart and prayers are with us. While, on the other hand, though he will doubtless labor earnestly and hard to prove that *some one will be damned*, yet the sentiment finds not an accordant string in his heart. He cannot pray, even, that his doctrine may prove true. Though he thinks it is true, he still wishes and desires that it may prove false. He desires the salvation of the world, and if he had the power, I should not fear much to trust the matter in his hands, weak and fallible as his judgment may be.

Another remark or two of a general character, and I shall proceed directly to the subject under discussion. As my peculiar doctrine and faith, touching the final destiny of the human race, is the topic of debate, it may not be out of place, that I request of you thus early, to lay aside your preconceived opinions and impressions concerning it, which may be the result of a misapprehension of its claims, or a false estimate of its teachings. I know full well the force of education in fastening upon the mind ideas, which, however erroneous, time can scarcely efface. And I am also aware that my doctrines have been held in utter abhorrence by the masses of the so called religious world, for a long time. But such impression, I am satisfied, is the result more of pulpit teachings, and the doctrines of the creed, than from any clear convictions upon the subject, drawn from either reason or revelation. I trust, therefore, that those who

honor me with a hearing upon this occasion, will not allow their prejudices to decide the present issue, but will be governed by the testimony presented, and the facts adduced. Let these be weighed well in the balance, and if found wanting, reject them, and discountenance them by all fair and honorable means.

It is my desire that during this discussion, no expression may fall from my lips void of christian courtesy, or that I shall have cause to regret having used when the debate shall have terminated. I have no other purpose in view in engaging in this investigation, than to advance what I conceive to be the plain and unvarnished truths of the Bible. Having full confidence in the truth of my doctrines, of their reformatory and happifying effect upon the mind diseased by sin, and led astray by error; and believing them to be in harmony with both reason and revelation, I have consented to become their humble exponent. He, who can see the heart, and is fully acquainted with all its workings, knoweth that the desire for what I conceive to be the truth, alone has prompted me to engage in this discussion. And should I be successful in establishing beyond the possibility of refutation, the doctrines I fondly cherish, I shall attribute such success to the power and omnipotence of truth, rather than to any particular merit or skill that I may manifest in their presentation.

Having said thus much of a general and personal

nature, I shall now proceed with the argument. And here in the outset, it may be well to lay down certain rules of interpretation by which we shall be governed in the pending controversy:

First—The Bible is a revelation from God to man, and as such it must be consistent and harmonious in all its parts. If, then, I can establish the truth of my proposition from any one testimony, or given number of testimonies, there is no other part of the sacred volume, which, when rightly construed and interpreted, will contradict the sentiment. So that it will not suffice for Mr. Lozier to affirm an opposite doctrine as true, which stands directly opposed to the testimonies we shall adduce. We shall expect him, therefore, to come right up to the work, and attempt to show at least, that our arguments are not sound, logical, and conclusive, and that the passages under consideration, teach some other doctrine than that we are laboring to establish.

Second—When any portion of scripture is of doubtful import, its meaning must be settled by reference to the character of the author, and the idiom of the age and language in which it was written. The celebrated Horne says: "The whole system of revelation must be explained so as to be consistent with itself. When two passages appear to be contradictory, if the sense of one can be clearly ascertained, in such case that must regulate our interpretation of the other."

I now proceed directly with the argument. My first argument is based on the *Divine Paternity*—the nature and character of God, and on his relation to the human family. While we are assured that he is the Creator of all, and has made of one blood all the nations of men, the fact is equally true, and susceptible of demonstration, that he is likewise the Father of all. Throughout the scriptures of divine truth, and particularly in the New Testament, God is described to be a wise, good, and affectionate Father. His love for his offspring is represented to us as far exceeding, infinitely, that of an earthly parent. This doctrine forms the chief characteristic, as it does the brightest glory of the gospel of the Son of God.

That God is the Father of all, the scriptures of divine truth abundantly testify. In the book of the prophet Malachi, chap. ii. 10, we have a strong testimony upon this point: "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?" Paul's beautiful response to the Athenian philosophers, as he stood upon Mars' Hill, Acts xvii. 26–29, inclusive, is eloquent with the same great thought: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of

us. For in him we live and move and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring." Ephesians iv. 6: "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." 1st Corinthians, viii. 6: "But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things." Ephesians iii. 14–15: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." In Hebrews xix. 9, he is called "The Father of spirits." That model prayer of our Savior also begins on this wise: "Our Father which art in heaven"—not "my Father," nor "your Father," but "Our Father." He is the Father of the whole human race.

Such is the relation that God bears to man—that of Father to the child. Nor does this relationship originate in a law or custom that may be severed at the discretion of the parties. It is a tie of nature, and hence cannot be destroyed. God will sustain this relationship to the human family as long as he himself shall exist. In the formation of this tie which binds man to God, he had no agency, nor does he possess a power by which he can sever it. Wherever you find a being bearing the impress of God's hand, there you find a child of God. No matter how far down the steeps of crime he may have gone—no matter how far he

may have wandered in the wilderness of sin—no matter what may be his moral condition, he is still, legitimately, a child of God, (though not an obedient child,) and an object of paternal solicitude.

That there is a scriptural sense in which some are children of God and some are not—a moral and scriptural sense—we are fully aware. Those who obey God, who walk in the light of his commandments—are *characteristically* his. They enjoy a nearness of relationship to which the disobedient are entire strangers. The word children in this spiritual sense is variously employed by the sacred writers. Professor Stuart, of Andover College, now deceased, has the following criticism on this point: "Every kind of relationship or resemblance, whether real or imaginary—every kind of connection is characterized (in the Bible) by calling it the son of that thing to which it stands related, or with which it is connected." Thus, a peaceable man is called the "*son of peace*"—one who sympathises with the unfortunate, the "*son of consolation*"—those who disobey are called the "*children of disobedience*," Ephesians v. 6. Those who are wise, the "*children of wisdom*"—those who are full of faith, the "*children of promise;*" and in accordance with the same scripture usage, those who love God with all the heart—those who imitate God, obey his commands, and walk in the light of his precepts, are called the "*children of God!*" But this does not militate

against the great fact that God is the Father of all, in the sense contended for in the proposition. The fact that the obedient are in this peculiar sense the "children of God," does not prove that in some sense the disobedient are not the children of God also. The fact that a portion of our race are alienated from him by disobedience, does not prove that they are not his by creation, and objects of his love and protection.

We have abundant testimony that God recognizes men as his children, even while subjects of sin and disobedience; but one or two must suffice on the present occasion. In Hebrews xii. 5, 6, we we read, "Ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you *as unto children.* My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Here we have the design of chastisement in the divine government beautifully set forth. It is no evidence that God does not love an individual when he chastens him; on the contrary, it is one of the strongest proofs of God's love to man. Again, in Jeremiah iii. 21, 22, we read: "A voice was heard from the high places, weeping and supplications of the children of Israel; for they have perverted their way, and they have forgotten the Lord their God. Return, *ye backsliding children,* and I will heal your backslidings." Thus you will see, that while God chastens and punishes

men for their sins, still he calls them *children!* So Paul, when speaking to the idolatrous Athenians, says: "We are also his offspring." The love of God for his children is the same in *nature* as the love of earthly parents for theirs; it only differs in *degree*, being greater, more enduring and infinite. While the love of an earthly parent is susceptible of change, and governed by mutations of an earthly nature, God's love is eternal and unchanging—as far reaching as the wants of universal humanity! And while the love of man is bounded in its sphere of operation, for the want of means to accomplish its aims and purposes, that of God is subject to no contingence that can in the least affect its benevolent designs. In proof of our position, and that we are fully warranted in our comparison between the divine and human love, we have numerous illustrations in the teachings of our Savior—the frequent contrasts by which he represents to our minds the superior depth and fulness of God's love towards his children. In fact, we would hardly appreciate in any adequate degree, the love of our heavenly Father, were it not for the opportunity afforded us of viewing it in contrast with the love of a kind and affectionate earthly parent. In Matthew vii. 9, Jesus says: "What man is there of you, whom, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is

in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" Is it not evident from this testimony, that the love of our heavenly Father, as portrayed by the Savior, is the same in nature as that of a good earthly Father, differing from it only in degree?" "*How much more* shall your Father which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him!" Again, we have a strong and affecting comparison in Isaiah xlix. 15: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee." Even the love of a mother for the babe that nestles in her bosom, falls infinitely short of the love of our heavenly Father. While the one is fading and transitory, the other is as enduring as the eternal throne. We have all had mothers, and can realize the full fruition of a mother's love. What will not the mother do for her child? What privations and sacrifices will she not undergo in his behalf? Though fortune may frown upon him—though the world in its want of charity may turn a deaf ear to his entreaties—the mother is ever ready to shield and protect him from danger and harm. Even though her boy may have descended to the lowest round upon the ladder of crime, and have forfeited his life upon the scaffold, even there a mother's love will follow him, and upon bended knee will she implore the benedictions of heaven upon him! Aye, place the immortal interests of her children in her hands, and who can doubt the

result? Would she not confer upon them the highest possible state of happiness and enjoyment? Is there a mother here to-night, who, divested of prejudice, would not readily acknowledge, that if she had the power, she would gladly bless and save not only all the members of her own little family circle, but the entire universe? Is there a child here, that would not feel perfectly safe in committing its eternal interests into a mother's hands? There can be but one response to these inquiries—but one answer given—and that in unison with our holy faith. And will the God of heaven do less for his children? Give the mother power to bring back her prodigal son into the path of safety and of rectitude, and how quickly she would do it! What hardships would she not endure that she might reclaim her sinful, erring child! Where did she get that little drop of love? Where is the fountain whence it springs? Does it not issue from the great ocean of divine love—the uncreated source of all good, and of all excellence? Place the eternal interests of all our race in a mother's hands, and all would be saved. She has love enough to save a world if she had the power. Is not God as good as that mother? Will he not do as much for his children as that poor, weak, frail being would do for hers? Can the little running stream do more than the great and mighty fountain from whence it issued; or can the effect exceed the cause? Will God cast off

his children forever, and abandon them to a state of endless wretchedness? No! no! Strong as is the mother's love, far as it extends, mighty as its influence is, God's love is stronger and more enduring. While there is a *possibility* that the *mother may forget* the darling of her bosom, God has declared that he will *never leave nor forsake his children;* that though he will certainly punish them if they transgress his laws, yet he will not utterly cast them off, nor suffer his love in their behalf to fail. Says Jehovah, by the mouth of David in Psalms lxxxix. 30–34, "If his children forsake my law and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgressions with a rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not *utterly take from him*, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that has gone out of my lips." God will visit trangressors with a *rod*, and their iniquity with *stripes*. But what kind of a rod is this to be? The brother thinks it is to be the iron rod of endless torment. But what does God say? "If they forsake my law *I will punish them*." Notice that expression—there is to be no escape. "I will visit them with a rod and their iniquity with stripes; *nevertheless*, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him." The sinner is to be punished, but mercy is to follow him still, and God will not cease to regard him with paternal solicitude.

And yet again, we find the same sentiment embodied in the words of Isaiah lvii. 16: "For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth, for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." What is the force of this language? God tells them that he will not contend forever—that he will not always be wroth, and he assigns the reason: "For the *spirit would fail before me.*" It is the spirit of man that he is speaking of. The soul of man itself, with all its powers, created as it is for immortality, could not support through endless ages the fiery fierceness of the wrath of God. The universal tendency of suffering is to destroy. Physical suffering consumes the vital energies of the body; mental agony wears away the powers of the mind. But how infinitely do the most subtle torments that human malice and ingenuity ever framed, fall below the torments of a soul subjected eternally to the wrath of God! Hence the language of Jehovah, "The spirit would fail before me"—the nature of man would sink beneath the load, and annihilation would follow.

I now leave the argument on the divine paternity, with the remark, that I regard it as one of the strongest that can be adduced in favor of the proposition. All the ingenuity and sophistry of my opponent can never overthrow it. Never, until he can prove that some are not the children of God, were not created in the divine image, are not

overshadowed with the love and care of heaven, can he destroy in the least the force of our argument.

My *second argument* is predicated upon the *love of God.* My proposition is, that God's love is infinite, and extends over all the creatures of his forming hand, and that finally it will subdue and reconcile the world to him; that as a God of love, he never would have created human beings for any other purpose than to make them holy and happy. The following testimonies we submit as the basis of our argument: 1st John, iv. 16, "We have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him." Paul also calls him a God of love. Our next testimony is John iii. 16, 17: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his son into the world to *condemn the world*, but that the world through him *might be saved!*" Romans v. 8: "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Eph. ii. 4, 5: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ."

Thus the Bible, throughout, speaks of God's love for his creatures. The fact that they are sinners, or have become alienated from him by

wicked works, does not deprive them of that love, nor cause it to slumber. He loves them still with a deathless love—a love that knows no diminution or change. Being, himself, immutable, and unchangable, his love must ever remain the same through time and eternity! The whole scheme of the gospel was the production of infinite love. It was the love of God that brought the Savior down to this earth, to bring to light that inheritance which is "incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." The whole human family stood in need of this interposition of God's love, as is evident from the declaration of the scriptures, that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God"—that they have "all gone out of the way"—they "have altogther become filthy"—"there is none that doeth good, no, not one;" that man was "made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope." Universal experience fully corroborates and confirms the account here given of man's sinfulness and imperfection. And when we view him as thus frail, fallible and mortal, we discover the wisdom, love, and benevolence of the Creator in giving his Son as a ransom for the sins of the world—to redeem man from this corrupt and sinful state, and introduce him into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

The love of God, then, was the originating cause of man's redemption, and we lay it down as

a proposition that cannot be successfully controverted, that man is now, and ever has been, the creature of God's love, and that this love will remain unchangably the same through all the cycles of eternity, bringing finally, the most incorrigible sinner to submit himself to its peaceful reign. A God of love would not create intelligent beings but for happiness. In their creation he must have had some end in view, and that end must have been in harmony with the divine attribute of infinite love.

Go back, if you please, and contemplate God as he existed before the world was—before the creative power had ever been put forth. Love was no less an attribute of God's nature then than now It was as vast, as eternal, as immutable. Hence the creation of the world was an act of the Almighty in full accordance with divine love. Enshrouded, as he was, from all eternity, with the light and glory of his own perfections, there was no necessity compelling him to create. The creative power was put forth, that he might have other objects on which to bestow the riches of his love. Hence, when man was formed in his own image, and ushered into being, he was the production of infinite love. The Creator's omnipotent energies were put forth in accordance with his own good will and pleasure. This conclusion is fully established by the testimony of John, in Revelations iv. 11: "Thou art worthy, O, Lord,

to receive glory, and honor, and power, for thou has created all things, and for *thy pleasure* they are and were created." If all beings were created for God's pleasure, will he take pleasure in tormenting any part of them endlessly? Let my friend make a note of this, and answer it.

From the beginning, therefore, the destiny of all beings was fixed in accordance with the dictates of *infinite love.* When it is said that God reigns, it it is but an assurance that *love reigns.* When it is is said that "he doeth his will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of earth," it is in substance saying, that *love does its will in heaven and upon earth.* From the fact, then, that God is a being of love, it is a self-evident conclusion, that love will ultimately triumph—that all will finally be subdued and reconciled to the will of God, and be happy. The celebrated author of Proverbial Philosophy, Tupper, says of this constituent element of the divine nature: "Love is the weapon which Omnipotence reserved to conquer rebel man, when all the rest had failed. Reason he parries; fear, he answers, blow to blow; *future interests* he meets with *present pleasure.* But LOVE, that sun against whose beams winter cannot stand; that soft, subduing slumber, which wrestles down the giant—there is not one human creature in a million—not a thousand men in all earth's huge quintillion, whose clay heart is hardened against love!"

Suppose that my opponent could even prove that all are not brought to obey God in this life, does it follow, as an inevitable conclusion, that they never will be brought to obey and love him? Are we hence to infer that man can *go beyond the reach of God's love?* Is there a narrow isthmus bounding time and eternity, and beyond which God's love can never go? Has God placed limits and bounds to the operations of his *love?* Where is the warrant for such an assumption? What is there in the nature of the soul that will prevent God's love from reaching it in and beyond the resurrection? Why does the brother find it so difficult to convert sinners now? Is it anything more than the unfavorable circumstances by which they are surrounded? Here they are encompassed in the habiliments of mortality, exposed to a thousand temptations and trials which are the offspring of an earthly organization. Here they are "made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope." Why, then, may not the soul be changed after death, when it shall be freed from all these mortal cumbrances? Is there any law, of which we have any knowledge, which can prevent the love of God from reaching the soul in the future world? God will be the same to the soul in the next world that he is in this; the same paternal, gracious, merciful, and forgiving God, for he changes not. Jesus can have the same access to the heart of the sinner there that he has here,

Will Mr. Lozier show us the dividing line that is to separate God's love from his creatures? When the veil of ignorance is removed from before the mortal vision—when man shall see God as he is—enshouded in the light and glory of his own perfections—when he shall see, and realize the height, and depth, and length, and breadth of the love of God, the hardest heart will relent, and the most obdurate sinner will cry "*Abba, Father;* thy will, not mine be done!" Says Paul, in Romans, viii. 38–39: "For I am persuaded that neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of Christ Jesus our Lord!" Man is yet to be brought to realize God's love, and to render him the worship and gratitude of a loving heart. Thus, in God's own due time, even "in the dispensation of the fulness of times," will infinite love work out the redemption of universal humanity.

My *third argument* is based upon the *Foreknowledge of God.* My proposition is, that God foreknows all things; which being the case, and God being, at the same time, infinitely holy and good he never would have created a single soul, without designing the holiness and happiness of that soul. Hence, we argue, from the fact that God foreknows an event, that it will positively take place.

That God foreknows all things is abundantly

testified to in the Scriptures. The Apostle says, in Acts xv. 18: "Known unto God all his works from the beginning of the world." Again, we read in Job xxiv. 1: "Times are not hidden from the Almighty." And yet again, in Isaiah xlvi. 9, 10: "I am God, and there is none like me, *declaring the end from the beginning*, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." God, therefore, possessing infinite foreknowlege, there can be with him no such thing as succession of ages or times. In Isaiah lvii. 15 verse, he is declared to be the "High and Holy One that inhabiteth eternity." All is one eternal now to him. All events are as present with him now as they ever will be—aye, were as present in the dawn of creation, ere yet the creative energies of his almighty arm had put been forth. The future of all beings lay unfolded to his view. Every event, down to the latest period in a world's history, was scanned with the eye of omniscience, nor has he permitted any contingence to arise that will thwart his purposes of love and goodness. God being infinitely wise, good, and holy, would not have created his offspring, unless he knew they would be the gainers thereby, and not the losers. Whatever destiny, therefore, awaits you and me, or any child of humanity, was clearly known to the mind of Deity at the time of creation; nor can we harbor the thought for one

moment, that God would create a single being, knowing that that being would be finally miserable, and thus infinitely more unfortunate than if God had never created him. He who could create with such a destiny in view, would be worse than a Nero, Caligula, or Robespierre, whose cruelties and abominations have so fearfully darkened the pages of a world's history. Bad as they were, their cruelties would sink into utter insignificance compared with such an act as that on the part of the Creator. Take man just as we find him, with all his sinfulness and depravity, his weakness and imbecility, encompassed as he is, with the frailties of an earthly nature, and ask him, whether with a full knowledge of all the misery and woe that would result from the act, upon the hypothesis that endless misery is true, he would consent to become a creator. Bad as man is, he would not consent to do that which my brother's theory ascribes to the great Jehovah! Now, remember, that God is a kind, indulgent Father, that he is good, that he is just, and that his tender mercies are over all his works," and then ask yourselves the question, would such a God do what even a frail, sinful man would not? If he foresaw that any being whom he designed to create would be finally plunged into such depths of misery, would not a good and merciful God have stayed his hand, and spared the universe such a tragic spectacle of woe? Certainly he would, if our conception of the divine character is at all correct.

Hence, we argue, that God, being infinite in all his perfections, has provided the means for the accomplishment of all the gracious plans of his economy, which his foreknowledge deemed necessary for man's final holiness and happiness. He knew all the impediments that would arise as obstacles in the way of this glorious consummation, and has so arranged the affairs of his government, that nothing shall hinder the perfection of his purposes.

Let Mr. Lozier meet the argument, and show how God, in accordance with his foreknowledge and love, can do otherwise than make all his creatures holy and happy.

This speech will close my work for to-night. I have not sufficient time remaining to introduce a new argument. I desire, however, before I close, to call your attention once more to the argument I have presented on the *Paternity of God*. I have shown you that it is the brightest link in the chain of human destiny; and until my friend shall prove that God will cease to be our Father, that argument will be firm and immovable, as the pillars of the eternal throne. I have introduced, also, an argument on the *Love of God*. I need not undertake to prove to this audience the great truth that God loves us. He loves you, and he loves me, to-night. How his watchful, protecting care has been about us all our lives. The sun has shone for you, and the rains have fallen for you; and, notwith-

standing, you may have forgotten God, he has not forgotten you. Every day of your lives have brought to you some fresh memento of his love.

Mr. Lozier will follow me in a few moments. I desire you to pay particular attention to the manner in which he meets my arguments. If he can show to your satisfaction that God will ever cease to maintain the relation to humanity of a kind Father, or that he will cease to love his creatures as he loves them now, and has always loved them, then, and not till then, will he have sustained the negative of the proposition.

MR. LOZIER'S FIRST REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

When I accepted the invitation of Mr. Foster to discuss the question already announced, it was my privilege to name certain stipulations whereby we were to be governed; and among them was that we were to have three discussions during this week, and three in the week following, beginning on Monday and continuing on alternate evenings during these two weeks. One reason for my making this stipulation was this: I am aware that the discussion of the doctrine of universal salvation, and the defense of that doctrine, is the gentleman's

trade or occupation. I am aware that he has not failed, on every occasion when he could secure a person to discuss with him, either here or elsewhere, to seek for such a discussion. And I was aware that he would come up here to-night with his arguguments cut and dry, and fully equipped and prepared to present in as perfect a condition as he could present them. Hence I shall take two days to prepare my reply. I knew that in the nature of things I could not do that thing; for my occupation has been ever since I have been a minister of the gospel, that of preaching the whole gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ—that of presenting, not simply and constantly, the question of whether or not every human being, good, bad and indifferent, pure and impure, holy and unholy, should at last land safe in heaven whether they would or no; but my business was to preach what was the plain teaching of the word of God. I have had to preach a doctrine that this gentleman has not seen fit to adopt or to advocate—if he had, he probably would not have had so many admirers in this community—and that doctrine is, that holiness is a *desideratum*, without which no man shall see the Lord. That is one of the doctrines that I have had to preach. Another doctrine that I have had to present continually to the people, is, that men might be saved, and would be saved, by and through repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; but the gentleman has intimated no such doctrine here to-night.

From all you can judge from what he has said, the world of mankind could have got along just as well without a Christ, as with one. For what use have we for a Christ under Mr. Foster's hypothesis? He told us a while ago that there was no possible avenue of escape, and that every person who sinned must take the penalty upon himself and endure it. What use then for a Christ? If every man is his own Savior, whose Savior is Jesus Christ? Every man is his own Savior to all intents and purposes upon the position Mr. Foster has laid down before you to-night.

I will go back a little further, I do not propose to take up these arguments and answer them now, I will simply direct attention to a few matters that he brought out.

In regard to the love of God—the love and mercy of God—we do not claim as the gentleman does, that that love and mercy are to be displayed in the saving of all men whether they will or will not be saved; but we claim that God has vindicated his love to the human race by providing the means, whereby man may be saved, if he will; and there is the broad difference in the platforms upon which he and I are standing. I claim to have as much respect for the love of God, and as high an appreciation of it as he has. I honor God for his goodness as much as he; but I do what he does not; I recognize the truth, that God has created mankind free agents; and the further truth, that

God's goodness, God's love, and God's foreknowledge, must consist with man's free agency. For man is a free agent, and God cannot be consistent with the laws that he has incorporated in our being, and save us against our will. It is true that God might have done otherwise; but the simple fact divested of all sophistry is, that he did not—that he made man a free moral agent and placed before him good and evil—giving him the power to choose between them. The volition is his, to choose the good, and live in peace forever, or to choose the evil, and forever suffer the reward of his evil doing.

The gentleman radiated very extensively for the amount of the foundation he had, on this matter of God being so full of love and at the same time deliberately consigning man to endless torment in hell-fire. I know some people are very liable to get scared at this hell-fire doctrine; and I am not going to talk about that subject now. The question just now under discussion is not whether men are going to be forever toasted and roasted in fire and brimstone. After awhile we will attend to that matter, when we come to discuss the duration and nature of the punishment of the wicked; but just now the question is, whether reason and scripture teach the doctrine of the final happiness and holiness of every individual of the human race. That is the question now.

Mr. Foster says, God would not have created

any of his intelligent creatures if he had known (as he must have known) that they were to be endlessly punished. Therefore, he concludes, every intelligent creature of God is to be restored, is to be released from that punishment which is inflicted upon him, at some time or other, whatever may be its character, and thenceforth be endlessly happy. The devil is one of God's intelligent creatures—when is he to get out? God foreknew the destiny of all his creatures, says Mr. Foster; that includes the devil as well as any body else, and God would not have created any one of his creatures if he had not designed him to be ultimately restored to their primal state of holiness and happiness. See where that leads to. The devil is to be released from his imprisonment and brought to heaven with all the rest of God's intelligent creatures. We are all to go there too; what then? We have got to strike hands with Jeff Davis, hug Captain Wirz, and kiss and make up with the devil, that has given us all the trouble we ever had in this world. Now, if God would create an angel, knowing that that angel would fall, and yet would forever punish that angel with the torments of hell, why will he not also punish eternally beings whom he has created a little lower than the angels? If God could create an angel of light, knowing that he would fall and go into everlasting punishment, why might he not create man, knowing that a portion of the human race would fall and be punished eternally for their sins?

God is a pure and holy being, I, as a minister of the gospel of his son, admit all that is claimed for him by Mr. Foster or his friends. I will say further, at the outset, that I desire salvation for the entire human race as much as any body. Mr. Foster is welcome to my admission at the outset, that I believe God desires the salvation of the whole race. He is welcome to the further admission, that desiring the salvation of all men he has set forth the terrors of the law demanding faith and repentance from every son of man as the condition of salvation. But he is also welcome to this other declaration, that the Bible no where intimates the salvation of any human being to whom the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is presented, and who does not accept it. I mean by that, when intelligibly presented, so as to be understood. We are not here to speak of idiots or heathen; but of intelligent persons who are capable of understanding language and comprehending ideas. But I have prepared an article in writing which embraces my views and which I propose to read.

"Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness of all mankind?"

I may as well remark right here, that it is not required of me by any rule of polemics, to prove that the Bible and reason do *not* teach that, my business is simply to let him prove that if he can, and if he can not, to show wherein he fails to prove it. The *onus* of proof is with him, and not with

me. If the scriptures teach it, the question for you and him to settle is *where* do they teach it; if reason teaches it, it will devolve upon him to show you *how*. The insertion of the word "reason" into the question at issue, seems to be an invention of Mr. Foster himself, intended to give him plenty of room to dodge in. I never heard of any case in which this qualification of the issue has been insisted upon by any of those who have advocated Universalism. For my part, I am willing to test this whole question by the Bible; for my view is, that whatever is reason is revelation, and any thing that is not consistent with reason is not revelation.

As this doctrine is the greatest doctrine that can possibly affect human destiny, it should have been given the greatest prominence by the Almighty. Is there any dispute in regard to that? If the doctrine of the final restitution of our race to a state of happiness and holiness is the great doctrine of the Bible, God should have given it the greatest prominence in the Bible, in order to be consistent with himself. It must be as distinctly set forth as its importance demands. He must show wherein the scriptures thus present it. To aid Mr. Foster in concentrating his forces, I here assert that if God designs to bring all mankind to a final state of holiness and happiness, he is as much bound by his love to reveal that fact to us as he was to reveal to us the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; for the resurrection is only the restoration of the *body*.

while this is the restoration of that which is infinitely more important, and infinitely more valuable —the soul; and God is bound, I say, by his love, and by the honor of Deity, to make that doctrine, if it be true, as distinct as that of the resurrection. The superior value of the soul would reasonably prompt the Almighty to give the fact of its final restoration great prominence in the teachings of the prophets, evangelists, apostles, and especially in those of Christ. It will be the business of Mr. Foster during this debate to show you where they have taught this doctrine clearly and distinctly. I assert that the Bible neither teaches nor intimates such a doctrine from the beginning of Genesis to the closing paragraph of the Apocalypse. The gentleman has not shown the point to-night. He has talked about God's redeeming love and foreknowledge, and all that; but he has not shown the scriptural proof, nor a scriptural intimation of that doctrine; not one.

I assert, moreover, and shall prove, at the proper time, that the scriptures clearly and positively teach the opposite, to-wit: the endless punishment of that part of the human race who reject the truth, and obey not the Son of God.

As to whether *reason* teaches such a doctrine, I would say, in the first place, that although I am not aware of any precedent for this peculiar wording of the question in any former debate, yet I assented to it, because I am willing to rest this ques-

tion upon reason alone, or upon the revelation of God alone. The power to discern the reasonableness of any proposition, is simply a question of mental development. The question to be decided is not, whether Mr. Foster's mind appreciates the truth of God—nor whether according to his reasoning all mankind are to be finally made holy and happy—it is quite a different question. I would remark, however, that the very statement of the question under discussion, concedes to the negative one very important point. Holiness is an essential requisite of happiness. Can there be such a thing as that kind of conformity to divine law, that perfect obedience to divine authority, which constitutes holiness, without free agency? Can you consistently or rationally praise a man for doing right, who could not do wrong? Or can you condemn a man for doing wrong who had not the power to do right? Can there be any such thing as either virtue or vice without free agency? Do you ascribe virtue or vice to mere machines? Is your watch "virtuous" because it keeps correct time? Has your watch become "vicious" because it gets worn out and useless? It is a machine, and to machinery we do not generally ascribe moral qualities, either good or bad. It is only to that which voluntarily acts, that such an ascription can be made. Man is a free agent. The first command that God gave to man, Gen. iii. 16, and the last invitation, Rev. xxii. 17, alike imply and teach the doc-

trine of man's free agency. Not a rule in the Bible, nor in the statutes of your nation, or state, nor a rule of your own domestic circle proceeds upon any other hypothesis than this: that we are free to do right or wrong at pleasure; and God is a liar and a hypocrite when he holds out to man an offer of mercy, unless he has left him perfectly free to obey or to disobey his commands; to regard and accept, or to disregard and refuse that offer of mercy. We, too, are hypocrites; and these gentlemen who gave you the rules by which this discussion is to be governed—they, too, were hypocrites when they gave you these rules by which I and Mr. Foster are to be governed, unless we are free agents. And in all of our conduct, we practically accept this doctrine as true; that all men are free to do right, or to do wrong; to obey, or to disobey. In fact, the whole system of governments, both human and divine, is a disgusting mockery—a farce—in any other view.

But, if man is a free agent, why this quibbling over the question of why God has made us thus? Your continual quibbling over the question of *why* it is so, does not disprove the fact that it is so. God had to do one of three things: make man a free agent, not make him at all, or to make him either a brute or a piece of machinery. If God had not made man at all, then all his creation would have been useless; if he had made him a brute or a machine, it would have been alike useless, and could not have added anything to his

glory; hence, God in his infinite wisdom, saw fit to extend the chain of divinely endowed intelligence one link lower, and man was made "a little lower than the angels." God made man in his own image—made him a free agent, and then set good and evil before him, and there he left him. Everything moved along happily, until the first Universalist preacher made his appearance, and commenced preaching his doctrine to Eve, in the garden of Eden. His discourse ran as follows: "Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? Ye shall not surely die, for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil." The scheme succeeded admirably. The preacher met with signal success. I know some persons who have sat under Mr. Foster's ministry for years, and are not yet fully converted to his faith. Said one old man, living down here in Ripley county, "I would give the best yoke of oxen on the place if I only knew it was so;" and he had been a professed Universalist for years, and had even then commenced preaching it himself. This memorable discourse in the garden of Eden, laid the foundation of Universalism, and proselyted Eve, who, in turn became a Universalist preacher, and converted Adam to the serpentine faith. Cain was the next convert, and in him we see the legitimate effect of the new doctrine; he sent Abel before him to that heaven to

which he was to go at a later day, and where he expected to meet him and be happy forever. The success of the doctrine kept pace with the growth of the race, until some sixteen hundred years after the creation, when there was almost a Universalist millenium; and if it had not been for that old bigot, Noah, the whole race of mankind would have been floated into this Universalist paradise, and not even a dog would have been left to wag his tongue against the saving efficacy of Universalism. Another merciful dispensation of divine providence, in saving mankind upon Mr. Foster's principle, is seen in the case of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, who were wheeled to heaven in chariots of fire. Pharaoh and his hosts furnish another memorable example of the successful workings of this scheme.

The poet has so aptly told this history that we will read his lines; or rather, we will sing them. I will line them to you, and you can all sing. Brother Foster will please to pitch the tune:

Thus Pharaoh and his mighty hosts,
  Had god-like honors given;
A pleasant breeze, brought them with ease,
  And took them safe to heaven!

So all the filthy Sodomites,
  When God bade Lot retire,
Went in a trice to paradise
  On rapid wings of fire!

Likewise the guilty Canaanites
To Joshua's sword were given;
The sun stood still that he might kill,
And pack them off to heaven!

God saw those villians were to bad
To own that fruitful land;
He therefore took the rascals up
To dwell at his right hand!

The men who lived before the flood,
Were made to feel the rod,
They missed the ark, but like a lark
Were washed right up to God!

But Noah, he, because you see,
Much grace to him was given,
Still had to toil, and till the soil,
And work his way to heaven!

The wicked Jews, who did refuse
The Lord's commands to do,
Were hurried straight to heaven's gate
By Titus and his crew!

How happy is the sinner's state
When he from earth is driven;
He knows it is certain fate
To go straight up to heaven!

There's Judas, too, another Jew,
Whom some suppose accursed;
Yet with a cord he beat his Lord,
And got to heaven first!

I do not mean to say that all these people had a creed in black and white, and called themselves Universalists; but that they only acted as Univer-

salists should act, in order to be true to their principles; for there is reason to believe that they all believed in the doctrine of Mr. Foster—in the ultimate holiness and happiness of all mankind, irrespective of moral character.

But from the remarks of Mr. Foster, to-night, I am led to believe that he, unlike these antediluvians, does really believe in the doctrine of future punishment; that he does not agree with them in regard to immediate transportation to heaven after death. As it is, I shall have to keep shooting between two bushes, not knowing which of the two he is behind. I do not fully know, as yet, whether he means to assert that all men are to go straight to heaven, or, on the other hand, that there is a sort of Universalist purgatory, to which some of them will go. I say a "Universalist purgatory," for I will not insult Catholicism, itself, with such a comparison; because, whatever may be the amount of error pertaining to the Roman Catholic system, it does recognize the necessity of salvation through Jesus Christ, in order to ensure future and final happiness. I am told that Mr. Foster has recently remarked to some of his confidential and intimate friends in Indianapolis, that he did believe there was a little hell after all.

One thing more upon this doctrine of restoration. If it is true that those who die impenitent, will, after expiating their crimes by suffering, be restored and made forever happy, then it follows,

as a necessary consequence, that it is optional with any one to go immediately to heaven by accepting Christ, or to reject Christ and go to purgatory for a while, until their wickedness is burned out of them, and then go off to join those who went straight from earth to Paradise. A man can, at his option, let Christ satisfy the just anger of the Deity; or, if he prefers, he can go to heaven in this roundabout way, and with no thanks to the Savior at all. He can sing, instead of that grand anthem of praise to the Lamb, this anthem of praise to himself: "Not unto thee, but unto my name be glory!" Such a monstrous doctrine must shock every ear. There is no soul in heaven, nor will there be throughout all the sinless future, who will not ascribe his salvation to Christ, and to Christ alone. "Thou was slain, and hast redeemed us unto God by thy blood," is the language of the redeemed. There will be no other song but this: "Unto Him that hath loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God, even the Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever."

SECOND NIGHT.

MR. FOSTER'S SECOND SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

RESPECTED FRIENDS:

A brief statement of the argument adduced on the last evening, and a notice of a few points contained in Mr. Lozier's closing speech, and I shall proceed to the further development of the subject under discussion.

My first argument was founded upon the *Divine Paternity*—upon the *nature* and *character* of God, and the relation that he sustains to the human family. Our proposition was, that God was the *Father of all mankind*—that his affection for his offspring is the same in nature as that of a good and wise earthly parent—differing only in degree and intensity, being more infinite and enduring. Hence, we argued, that he would ultimately bestow upon his children an eternity of happiness and joy! That even in his *punishments*, he would not forget the relationship of *Father!*

But how does Mr. Lozier meet the argument presented? By telling us that he wanted *two days to prepare a reply!* If our argument was not sound and conclusive—if our position was false and erroneous, why was he not ready to reply at once? A sad confession for one to make who has been preaching these many years past! But he has had the *two days*, and I suppose we shall hear at least, an *attempt* at a reply in his next speech.

My next argument was upon the *love of God*. My proposition was, that God *loves all mankind*. The fact that they are sinners, does not alienate that love, or cause it to slumber. We laid it down as a truism, clearly deducible from our premises, that man *is now*, and *ever has been*, the object of God's love, and that this love will remain unchangably the same through time and eternity! and that finally it will cause the hardest heart to melt before it, and bring all human intelligences under the sway of its mild and peaceful influences!

But how does he meet this argument upon the love of God? Like the other upon the divine paternity, by telling us that we must wait *two days* for a reply!

Our third argument was predicated upon the *foreknowledge of God*. We argued that an infinitely wise and good being would not have created human intelligences in accordance with his foreknowledge, without designing their ultimate happiness and bliss! From the fact, therefore,

that God foreknows an event, it is proof positive that it will take place. The following testimonies were cited in proof of our position: Acts xv. 18. Job xxiv. 1. Isaiah xlvi. 9, 10.

And this argument, like the rest, must needs lie over *two days* for a reply. What must you think of a man who stands as a prominent light in the church, and who is the accredited Secretary of the *Evangelical Ministerial Association* of this city, when he tells you that he is not prepared to combat error, but wants *two days* for preparation! Ah! brother Lozier, I am fearful the *two days* are not sufficient, and that you will find the task you have undertaken a hard one, and fruitless in results.

Thus much in brief, by way of a review of my arguments advanced on Monday evening. I shall now proceed to notice some other matters in his speech, before introducing other testimonies in proof of our proposition. He says that discussion is my *trade* or *occupation*, and that my arguments are all *cut and dried*. This, I suppose, is an apology for his own weakness and failure to meet them. As to my "occupation" and "trade," a portion of this audience, at least, will bear me witness, that I have endeavored to the utmost of my ability, to discharge the duties of an ambassador of Christ, in preaching the word of reconciliation. I have no disposition, if I had time to follow Mr. Lozier in his carricature upon Universal-

ism—or in his attempts to burlesque and ridicule my sentiments—and unless I am mistaken in reading the countenances of even his own friends, I do not think his course met with their approval. Such attempts at ridicule, such carricatures of doctrines sacredly cherished and believed in by large numbers in almost every community, might do for a demagogue and mere politician; but for one who occupies the position of a christian teacher, they are unbecoming and out of place, and but illy comport with the spirit and genius of christianity! But I suppose, in the absence of argument, it was necessary to indulge in witicism and ridicule to fill up his time.

But lest it should be thought by some that there was a semblance of argument in some of his assertions and assumptions, I shall proceed to notice two or three of the most prominent among them. He says that all things went smoothly enough in the dawn of creation, until the first Universalist minister made his appearance in the garden of Eden, and taught his doctrine to Eve, who embraced it, and then proselyted Adam. He then refers to Cain as the first fruits of the doctrine, and so on, takes in the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as the antediluvians of the old world, and thinks it a great blessing upon the hypothesis of Universalism, that they were all safely transported to heaven! And in this connection, he read to the audience some verses carricaturing our

doctrines, and bringing in Pharaoh and his hosts, Judas Iscariot, and a number of other matters, as illustrating the workings of Universalism, which excited some laughter among his friends, and which may have been supposed by some to be original. For their information, I would just say, that so far from being original, I have all the poetry, just as he read it, in a work by Alexander Hall, entitled "Universalism against itself," which work also contains the substance of all that he said in that connection. So you see that I will not only have to meet Mr. Lozier in this debate, but Mr. Hall also.

But what are the facts in the case? Are his assumptions correct? Let us see whether the doctrine of Universalism, or that taught by Mr. Lozier, was proclaimed in the garden of Eden. Turn to the account. In Gen. ii. 17, we find the threatening pronounced upon the first pair for the transgression of the first law ever given: "But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in *the day* that thou eatest thereof thou *shalt surely die!*" But no, says Mr. Lozier; man is not punished in the day of transgression, but at some future time. Nor is it even certain that he will be punished at all! This is what the serpent said, "*Ye shall not surely die!*" So Mr. Lozier and the serpent proclaim the same sentiment. Turn again to the curse pronounced after the transgression, Gen. iii. 14–20. Read the whole

account, especially the last three verses, which are as follows: "And unto Adam he said, because thou has hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it *all the days of thy life;* thorns and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee, and thou shall eat of the herb of the field: In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, *till thou return unto the ground;* for out of it wast thou taken;" for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." From this it, will be seen that the curse was to extend no farther than the *days of his life.* It is not said that he should be *cursed in eternity!* Nor is there the least intimation of any such sentiment in the whole account.

So in the case of Cain. In Gen. iv. 12, we find the sentence passed upon him, "A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be *in the earth!*" Not *in eternity!* And it isall mere assumption on the part of Mr. Lozier, to say that any of the characters he has specified, are to suffer a torment in the future world. Let him cease in his attempts at ridicule, and meet the argument upon a fair issue.

He is very desirous of knowing whether I believe in a purgatory or not, and intimated to you that I had really began to believe in a little hell! Before we are done, we shall show that we believe in more hell than Mr. Lozier. Many persons in my own church believe in the doctrine of future

punishment. The issue now before us, however, is in regard to the *final* holiness and happiness of all mankind. It matters not, so far as the present discussion is concerned, whether all men go directly to heaven, or whether a thousand years, or million of ages shall elapse, before they are permitted to enter that glorious abode. Their *final holiness and happiness* is the only question involved! The question is not in reference to hell, whether there is a little or a great deal, or any hell at all! But "Do the scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?" Let Mr. Lozier confine himself to the question, and cease his quibbling and assumptions.

In regard to his compliment to our Catholic friends, many of whom are present, it was no doubt very kindly received, especially as they know how much *love* he has for that Church.

Again, he says, "I assert that the Bible neither teaches nor intimates the doctrine of the final restitution of all things from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation!" Suppose I were to make a counter assertion, what would it prove! Nothing at all. Assertions are nothing without testimony. Why does he not give us something in proof of his assertions?

But Mr. Lozier is considerably troubled, fearing he may have to associate with Jeff. Davis, Wirz, and the devil, in the future world, upon the hypothesis that my doctrine is true. So far as the devil

is concerned, he need have no fears, for he is to be *destroyed!* "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also likewise, took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, *that is the devil*; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Heb. ii. 14, 15. Jeff. Davis is already a convert to Mr. Lozier's doctine, and is said to be extremely pious. So that if he has only repented, and been converted, no matter what may have been his former character or condition, he is now a fit subject for the kingdom of immortal blessedness! And as for Wirz, he too was penitent, and is saved according to Mr. Lozier's theory. Not only so, but nine-tenths of all the murderers that have ever been executed in this country since the foundation of our government, have been pronounced fit subjects for heaven, before swinging from the scaffold! No matter how many murders they have committed, the penalty can easily be avoided by a timely repentance, and their salvation secured in heaven!

What was said upon free agency will be attended to at another time. I now proceed with my affirmative argument. My *fourth* argument is based upon the *government of God*, and its gracious and paternal design. That God is the ruler and governor of the universe, and that all human intelligences are subjects of his government, is a proposition clearly deducible from the sacred pages. In 1st

Chron. xxix. 11, 12, we read: "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power and the glory, and the majesty; for all that is in heaven, and in the earth is thine; *thine is the kingdom*, (and the power,) O Lord, and thou art exalted as *head above all.* Both riches, and honor come of thee, and thou *reignest over all.*" Psalms xcvii. 1: "The *Lord reigneth*, let the earth rejoice." Matt. vi. 13: "For *thine is the kingdom*, the *power*, and *the glory*, *forever*, Amen." These testimonies are sufficient to prove the fact that God is the supreme ruler of the universe. And as such, in the establishment of his government, he must have had some specific object in view. Being infinite in all his attributes and perfections, nothing short of the final well being and happiness of all the subjects of his government, could have been contemplated in its construction. And hence in the administration of his government the Creator has put in operation those laws and agencies which are ultimately to secure the end had in view when the government was first framed. No contingence has been permitted to arise to subvert its original intention and design. All the laws established, and penalties annexed for their violation, are in perfect harmony and keeping with the benevolent purpose of the government. They are the enactments of a wise and kind Father, having equal reference to the final good of all his children. Thus, as a holy and wise being, he has so arranged all the affairs of his government,

that they shall tend to bring about the perfection and happiness of the entire body of humanity. Any other view than this, of God's government, would impeach his goodness and love, and make shipwreck of the fondest desires that ever vibrated in the human soul. For if the foundations of the divine government are not firm and stable—if they are not anchored in the immutable promises and purposes of Jehovah—if they have not equal reference to the ultimate well being of all mankind, then, indeed, are we like the mariner upon the ocean, without chart or compass, not knowing whither we are going, or where our journey will end!

But to some further testimonies in support of our proposition; for I intend building an argument upon the government of God, that all the batteries of my opponent can never destroy. In Psalms xxii. 27, 28, we read: "*All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord*, and *all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee!*" Mark the reason assigned for this universal homage in the latter part of the 28th verse: "For the *kingdom is the Lord's*, and he is the *ruler among the nations!*" No language could be more expressive of universality than this. And all biblical students know that the phrase "all the ends of the world" as employed in the scriptures, denote all mankind. And the reason assigned by David for this universal turning to the Lord, is the best that could possibly have been given. Because he is the

rightful sovereign and ruler of the Universe. But we have another testimony, which is, if possible, stronger than this. You will find it in Psalms lxxxvi. 9: "*All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name!*" Could language be more plain and postive in expressing the truth of my proposition? How many nations has God made? Paul declares that "he hath made of one blood *all nations!*" All nations therefore, that have ever existed, or that will exist in the coming ages of the future, "*shall come and worship before him, and shall glorify* his name!"

Thus we have the most positive assurance of a time coming in the future, when God shall receive the praise and homage of universal humanity! True, all are not now obedient subjects of God's government—all may not be brought fully to obey the requirements of God's law in this life. What then? Does it follow that they will never be brought into subjection to it—that they will never obey its requirements? What are the requirements of the law? Math. xxii. 37, 39: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all they soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang *all the law*, and the prophets." Again says an Apostle, "*Love* is the *fulfilling of the law.*" Upon ev-

ery being in the universe this law is binding, and sooner or later they must be brought to obey its requirements." Jesus says that "not one jot or tittle of this law shall pass until it all be fulfilled!" To which we respond amen, so let it be! Here is a consummation worthy of a God of love, and in harmony with the desires of all truly good persons. If the law of God is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself," can that law be fulfilled unless all intelligent creatures are brought to love God and man? David says: "The law of the Lord is *perfect, converting* the soul!" Psalms xix. 7. This glorious work may not be brought to perfection here, but we have the blessed assurance that it will finally be accomplished! Let Mr. Lozier take hold of the argument, and show that it is not valid and conclusive.

I now proceed to introduce my *fifth argument*, which I shall predicate upon the *promise to Abraham*—a promise which Paul affirms contained the substance of the gospel. You will find the promise recorded in Gen. xxii. 15–18, inclusive: "And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, saying, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord; for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son; That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy

seed shall possess the gate of his enemies. An in thy seed *shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;* because thou hast obeyed my voice." The same promise was repeated unto Isaac in Gen. xxvi. 3, 4: "Sojourn in this land and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries; and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham, thy father. And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and I will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed *shall all the nations of the earth be blessed!*" And yet again, we find the promise confirmed unto Jacob, in Gen. xxviii. 13, 14: "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west and to the east, and to the north and to the south; and in thee, and in thy seed, *shall all the families of the earth be blessed!*" And Peter when quoting the promise in Acts iii. 25, says: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed *shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed!*" And Paul assures us in Heb. vi. 13–17, that the promise was confirmed by an oath. "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself saying, surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I

will multiply thee. And so after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater; and an oath for confirmation is an end of all strife. Wherein, God, willing more abundantly, to show unto the heirs of promise, the *immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath!*" Here we have a promise then, embodying the blessing of "all the *nations*, *families*, and *kindreds* of the earth," in the seed of Abraham, which is Christ. The only question remaining is, shall this promise ever be fulfilled, or is it to fail? Saith the prophet, "Hath the Lord spoken and will he not do it?" Paul says of Abraham, "That he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, being fully persuaded that what he had *promised he was able also to perform!*" The promise of Jehovah is immutable, and his word has been pledged that universal humanity shall yet bow the knee, and hail him Lord of all! And the prophet assures us that "God is not man that he *should lie;* nor the son of man that he should repent." Hence, we are willing to take him at his word, and believe that he will fulfil all his designs and purposes of goodness embraced in this promise to Abraham. Mr. Lozier will no doubt attempt to show, as did Dr. Clarke, that this promise has reference to a *national blessing*—that the nations of the earth were to be blessed by having the gospel preached unto them. But you will mark the language used in Gen. xxviii. and Acts iii. where it says "*families*" and

"*kindreds!*" Hence it embraces all who are members of families, or who have any kindred, and is therefore universal in its application. But we leave our argument, hoping that Mr. Lozier will give it his early attention.

My *sixth argument* is based upon the *will of God.* My first testimony you will find in 1st Tim. ii. 1–5, inclusive. "I exhort therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, *who will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth!* For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself *a ransom for all*, to be testified in due time." Here the language of the Apostle is simple, plain, and easy of apprehension. No ambiguous phrases occur. "Who will have *all men to be saved*, and *come unto the knowledge of the truth!*" The same "all" whom Timothy was commanded to pray for; the same "all" for whom Christ gave himself a ransom. It would be impossible for me to select words more expressive of *universality!* The language is not metaphorical, but is couched in such terms and phrases, as can be comprehended by even the weakest intellect.

God, then, having *willed* the *salvation* of *all men*,

he must necessarily have willed all the means and agencies adequate to secure the result. Even an imperfect being like man, never determines to do a cetrain work within the range of his power, without providing all the means necessary to secure its consummation. Nor can we harbor the thought for one moment, that God has undertaken the work of man's salvation, without making every provision necessary to bring about such a grand and glorious result. His resources are unbounded—the means at his command unlimited—and hence there can be no such thing as *failure* in accomplishing his *will*. The great scheme of human redemption then, comprehends the will of God as expressed by Paul to Timothy. And to accomplish this will, Jesus expressly declares to be one of the great objects of his mission. In John vi. 38, 39, he says, "I came down from heaven, not to do *mine own will*, but the *will of Him* that hath sent me, and this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of *all which he hath given me I shall lose nothing*, but should raise it up again at the last day." How many were given to him? David says of his spiritual kingdom, Psalms ii. 8, "Ask of me, and I shall *give the heathen for thine inheritance*, and the *uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession!*" Again, in John iii. 35, we are told that "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given *all things into his hand!*" And Paul, in Hebrews, declares that he was "appointed *heir of all things!*" In John iv. 34, he says, "My meat is to do the

will of Him that hath sent me, and to FINISH HIS WORK!" Mr. Lozier says the work will never be finished, but that a large part of those whom Christ came into the world to redeem and to save, will be consigned to the vortex of ruin, there to remain as long as the throne of God shall endure! Would Christ have undertaken the work, had he supposed for a moment that there would be a failure in the matter? Would such a result *finish God's work*, which is the *salvation of the world?* Will Mr. Lozier liken Christ to the foolish builder, who commenced building without *counting the cost*, and therefore was not able to finish? Will he fail of bringing all to the knowledge of the truth? Only on the hypothesis that the means placed at his disposal were insufficient for the task. That power sufficient was given him to enable him to fulfil his mission in this respect, will be seen by consulting John xvii. 2: "Thou hast given him *power over all flesh*, that he should give *eternal life to as many as thou hast given him!*" Again, in Matthew xxviii. 18, "*All power is given unto me*, in heaven and in earth!"

Thus God's *will* is that *all shall be saved!* Christ came to do that will, and to *finish his work!* He had the power and means at his disposal, and hence will succeed in bringing "all to a knowledge of the truth!" In the prophecy of Daniel iv. 35, we read: "He doeth *according to his will*, in the army of heaven, and *among the inhabitants of earth*,

and *none can stay his hand*, or say unto him, what doest thou?" Let Mr. Lozier show, if he can, that God's will is not supreme—that it can be frustrated by man, and he will have done something in the way of answering our arguments.

My *seventh argument* is founded upon the *universal reign of righteousness in Christ*, as taught by Paul in Romans v. 18–21: "Therefore as by the offence of one, *judgment came upon all men to condemnation*, even so, by the righteousness of one, the *free gift came upon all men* unto *justification of life*. For as by one man's disobedience *many were made sinners*, so by the obedience of one, shall *many be made righteous!* Moreover, the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, *grace did much more abound*. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord."

The argument of the apostle in this chapter, is one of the most complete and convincing proofs of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, to be found in the New Testament. He recognizes in verse 12, and elsewhere, the universal sinfulness of the human race, and predicates on this, the love of God in sending his Son into the world. And this very phase in the condition of humanity, which, according to Mr. Lozier's theory, is forever to exclude the sinner from God's presence, is the very reason assigned by the apostle *why he is to be*

saved! In the testimonies quoted, we have the condemnation of death placed in the scale on the one hand, and the justification by life on the other, the object of which is to show, that *as extensive* as may be the *effects of sin* and death, *even so universal* will be the *life and righteousness!* The word "many," in the 19th verse, corresponds with the phrase "all men," in the 18th. This fact is admitted by eminent commentators, who do not believe in the doctrine of the salvation of all men. The celebrated *Macknight* says, "The word *many* stands for the phrase *all mankind!*" Dr. Clarke says "That the *oi polloi, the many*, of the apostle here means *all mankind*, needs no proof to any one but the person who finds himself qualified to deny that all are mortal. And if *the many*, that is *all mankind*, have died through the offence of one, certainly the *gift by grace*, which abounds unto the *tous pollous, the many*, by Jesus Christ, must have reference to *every human being!*" Turn to the 15th verse: "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." Here we find a contrast between the offence or sinfulness of all men as represented in Adam, and the gift of holiness for all men, in Christ, the second Adam, and Lord from heaven! And you will notice the fact, that the language is used in its strongest mode of expres-

sion. The grace is said to abound *much more* than the sinfulness of men, so that it will be abundantly able to overcome all opposition. It will be observed that we have the same "many" spoken of, which is alluded to in the 19th verse, and which embraces universal humanity, or all who are made sinners. But the apostle goes even farther than this, and makes the subject, if possible, plainer, in the closing verses, by declaring that the reign of grace is to extend *beyond that of sin and death!* That it is to end in the destruction of both these opposing influences. Verses 20th and 21st, "Moreover, the law entered that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, *grace did much more abound;* that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so, might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Thus *grace is to reign beyond sin and death!* But how can this be, if sin and death are to prove equally powerful, and to resist successfully the efforts of grace for their destruction? How can grace extend *over and beyond that which has no end?* Such a thing is impossible. The *condemnation of all men for sin*, then, is to end in the justification of *all men* with a *life unending and glorious!* Thus will Christ's love, which shone so brightly throughout his eventful career, and which shed such a halo of divine glory around the cross, attract all souls to God—reclaim the erring, bring back the wandering, and cause all the children of

sin and sorrow, to rejoice in the clear sunlight of truth. The condemnation of sin in every soul will be followed by justification of life! Grace will reign triumphant in every heart!

Here is a consummation at once glorious, and embodying the highest forms of good, of which it is possible for the human mind to conceive. Evil is no longer a thing to be dreaded, whose consequences are to run parallel with eternity, holding in endless captivity, myriads of human intelligences! But like the mists before the brightening sun, it is destined to disappear before the rays of divine grace and truth! I cannot better close my argument upon the grace of God, than by giving you Dr. Clarke's comment on the passages under consideration. He says, "Thus we find that the *salvation from sin here, is as extensive and complete, as the guilt and contamination of sin! Death is conquered, the devil confounded, hell disappointed, and sin totally destroyed! Amen! Hallelujah! The Lord God omnipotent reigneth! Amen and Amen!*" We want no better Universalism than this. Death conquered, the devil confounded, and *sin totally destroyed!* Let Mr. Lozier meet the argument if he can, and give a reason why it is not sound and conclusive.

My *eight argument* is predicated upon the *kingdom and reign of Christ.* My proposition is, that all are subjects of Christ's kingdom and reign, and hence the administration of his government has

reference to the final good and happiness of all intelligences! My first testimony will be found in 1st Cor. xv. 25, 26, "For he must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet: The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." This language admits of no limitation whatever. The phrase "all enemies," embrace all the forces of opposition to man's happiness and peace, and all these are to be destroyed! In Daniel, vii. 14, we have a prophecy of the setting up of this kingdom, "And there was given dominion, and glory, and a *kingdom*, that *all people*, *nations*, and *languages* should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which *shall not be destroyed!*" During the reign of Christ in this kingdom, he administers *rewards and judgments*, and with the close of his reign, the dispensation of rewards will cease. His judgment seat was set up at the *beginning of his kingdom*—not to be established, as Mr. Lozier contends, at the close, or winding up of the affairs of the kingdom. It is not the *severity*, but the *certainty* of punishment, that makes it efficacious—and when you teach mankind that there is no escape from the consequences of transgression—that "the *way of the transgressor is hard*,"—that though hand join in hand, the *wicked shall not be unpunished*"—then, and not till then, will vice be banished from our world, and society upon earth become the image of heaven above! But to other

testimonies, and I hope Mr. Lozier will note them down. In Isaiah xlii. 1–5, inclusive, "Behold my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth *judgment* to the Gentiles. He shall not lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench; he shall bring forth *judgment* unto truth. He shall *not fail*, nor be discouraged till he have set up *judgment in the earth!*" No allusion to a *judgment in eternity!* Here is a prediction of Christ's reign, and of the establishment of his *judgment in the earth!* The language is plain and positive, and admits of no false construction. Again, we have another testimony equally conclusive, in Jer. xxiii. 5: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David, a righteous branch, and a *king shall reign* and prosper, and shall execute *judgment and justice in the earth!*" Not *in eternity!* There is no ambiguity in the language here employed. It is a plain prophecy of the establishment of Christ's *rule and reign in the earth!* The testimony of the Savior fully corroborates the prediction of Isaiah and Jeremiah. In John v. 22, he says: "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed *all judgment to the Son.*" Again, in John ix. 39, he says: "*For judgment I am come into this world!*" And in John xii. 31, we read, "*Now is the judgment of this world*; now shall the prince of this

world be cast out." Thus we have the prophecy and its fulfillment, in regard to the reign and judgment of Christ in the earth. And this is the uniform testimony of the scriptures in regard to rewards and punishments. David says, Psalms lviii. 11, "Verily there is a reward for the righteous; verily he is a God that *judgeth in the earth!*" So we read in Jer. ix. 24: "But let him that glorieth, glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness, *judgment and righteousness in the earth!*" In 1st Cor. xv. already alluded to. Paul says: "*Then cometh the end*, when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom* to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign until he hath put all things under his feet. The *last enemy* that shall be destroyed, *is death!*" Yes, my friends, the reign of Christ is to continue until death itself is destroyed; until "all enemies,"—all sources of opposition whatever to the Messiah's reign, shall be utterly destroyed! And then, when the glorious and final consummation is wrought, of all that Christ came into our world to accomplish—then we are told, "he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father, that he may be all in all!" This is at the end of his reign. How can any one doubt in view of these testimonies, that the reign of Christ is established, and that his righteous judgments are meted out, not in eternity, but *in the earth!* The scrip-

tures are replete with allusions to the happy and peaceful nature of the termination of Christ's reign. It is to end in the holiness and happiness of every creature for whom Christ died. Let Mr. Lozier show *one passage*—it is all we ask, where it is said that Christ's judgment was to be established *in eternity*, or that God's judgments are meted out in a future state.

What would you think, my friends, of a government that should establish its judgment at the close or winding up of its affairs? And yet, this is the theory of Mr. Lozier in regard to God's government. All judicial tribunals are established with the commencement of a government—and rewards and punishments are administered during its progress, and with its termination they cease. And so it is with the government of God, whether administered under his immediate supervision, or through Christ, as his agent or ambassador.

In the testimony presented from Corinthians, after affirming the general truth, that Christ is to reign until "all enemies are destroyed," he says: "The last enemy, that shall be destroyed is death." Here is a conquest which is to seal the great work of his mission—a result in unison with every holy desire of the human heart. And who can doubt this glorious result of Christ's reign? This final triumph of universal humanity over sin and death? What a jubilatic day will that be, when universal humanity shall emerge from the

darkness of error, sin, death and the grave, into the glorious light and liberty of the children of God! Truly did Jesus say, "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven!" Then will be fulfilled and verified, what was prefigured to the inspired Revelator, when "every creature in heaven and earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, and all that are in them, shall be heard saying, Blessing and honor, and glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever!" Then too, shall be fulfilled the sublime prediction of the Psalmist, when "all the nations whom God has made shall come and worship before him, and shall glorify his name"—when "all the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him!"

But we must close our argument for the present. The testimonies we have introduced are plain and forcible, and I hope Mr. Lozier will find time to notice them without waiting *two days*. I regret that my fifty minutes is so short, as I had much more testimony that I had designed introducing at this time. Hoping that Mr. Lozier will at least *attempt* a reply to my arguments, I leave them with you, trusting that you will weigh them well in your minds, and be governed by the evidence presented.

MR. LOZIER'S SECOND REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I presume the apology that Mr. Foster so kindly offered for my negligence in not answering all of his arguments on last Monday night, is amply satifactory to all who were here. I thank him for presenting the apology so forcibly. It may be my misfortune and infirmity, that I am not willing to undertake to answer the arguments he presents, in all cases, on the same evening that they are presented. If the gentleman shall succeed in answering those that I present, on the same evening that they are presented, when I am in the affirmative, you will observe this fact, that the Almighty has blessed him, at least in one particular, in which he has not favored me; and I think Mr. Foster should be very thankful for it. We shall see how that is, when the proper time comes. I understand very well the object of the gentleman in undertaking to address you, as he did, concerning me: it was to lead your minds entirely from the points I presented. I shall show you that he has failed to answer me.

He told you that I stood before you for the space of thirty minutes, last Monday evening, and said nothing at all in reply to his arguments, but told you I would wait two nights before I undertook to answer them; and that all I said had nothing at all to do with the question. He had a great deal to

say about the vile caricature and abuse that he regarded me as having been guilty of on that evening. I must confess, that if all he insinuates is true, you are a delightful set of ninnies to set still so patiently, in the face of such vile language and such abuse. It is not at all complimentary to the audience, to say the least. But you know, ladies and gentlemen, whether such was the fact or not; and if, with your knowledge of the facts, Mr. Foster will stand up before you and make an assertion of that kind, let him take the consequences—let him assume the responsibility of doing it, and you form your own estimate of his conscience.

I shall now take the occasion to reply to his arguments advanced on last Monday evening. This was my plan from the outset, and I shall follow it.

The first argument advanced by Mr. Foster, was an argument hypothecated on the *paternity* of God. I wish to say to Mr. Foster, that he waded through a vast amount of scripture to prove a doctrine that we all cordially accede to: and that is, that God is "the God and Father of us all." A great deal of labor was expended over a matter that was not in issue. We agree as to the paternity of God. Furthermore, we agree as to the love, and as to the foreknowledge of God, also. We agree with him fully as to those doctrines, but not as to his deductions from the paternity, the love, or the foreknowledge of God.

In the first place, God is our Father in the cre-

ative sense, and in that sense, we are all the sons of God. We are his offspring, and as his offspring, his love to us is like that of a parent to his children, only more intense; and if there was no moral difference in men, there would be no difference in God's dealings towards them in the day of judgment. So far, so good. But right here, Mr. Foster's argument fails. He does not recognize the fact distinctly set forth in the scriptures, that in the high moral sense, that which involves the question of punishment, we are not all children of God. In that moral sense, they are aliens from God, and described by God himself as being not his children. Now for the testimony. Here what Paul says to the Ephesians in his Epistle to that people, ii. 12, 13: "At that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ." What is the extent and nature of this alienation which Paul has here alluded to? Let John answer: "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness, is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." This language is from the 1st Epistle of John iii. 10. Here we find another class of "children" specified by the apostle, "the children of the devil." There are these two classes:

the children of God and the children of the devil. All children of God by creation, but one class no longer children of God morally, but children of the devil through sin.

Again, hear Jesus himself speaking to the Jews in the treasury of the temple, John viii. 41–44, inclusive: "Ye do the deeds of your Father. Then said they to him, we be not born of fornication; we have one Father, *even* God. Jesus said unto them, if God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." Whose children were these? The children of the devil; quite another class from those who are the children of God. All this can signify but one thing, and that one thing can be nothing else but this: that while all are children of God by creation, many have become the children of the devil, by wickedness and alienation from God. It means nothing, unless it means that. Notwithstanding Mr. Foster's assertion, that no matter how far down the steeps of sin a man may go, he is a child of God, Christ and the apostle say, he becomes a child of the devil. This is the relation in which a portion of the sons of God by creation stand to-day; and Mr. Foster's argument fails to show that they shall be finally holy and happy, except upon condition of repentance and faith in

the Lord Jesus Christ. Here is the broad difference between Othodoxy and Universalism. Universalism claims that God cannot be a God of love, and let man be lost. We, on the other hand, claim that while God is a God of love, he has done all that he could do for man's salvation, consistently with his free agency, leaving it wholly optional with man to resist God and die, or to serve him and live forever. Here is the only way of escape God has provided for these children of the devil. It is set forth in the declaration Paul makes to the churches of Galatia, found in Galatians iv. 4–7, inclusive: "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his son into your hearts, crying *Abba, Father!* Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." Mr. Foster says they were sons already. Paul says, "Christ came into the world in order that they might receive the adoption of sons." Let me direct your attention a little further to this wonderful display of grace, on God's part, in sending his Son into the world in order that we might become the children of God. The apostle says, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life?" Did you observe how Mr.

Foster quoted that passage, on last Monday evening? There is a great deal in the manner in which we quote. He was enlarging on the love of God to the human race, and when he came to this passage, he made it read: "God so LOVED the world," and so on, placing all of the emphasis upon the word "loved," and skipping over the words "whosoever believeth," in such a way that the real meaning of the passage is covered up. Eternal life is for "whomsoever believeth." If they believe, what then follows? Let us go to the Apostle Paul for an answer. We have it in Romans viii. 16, 17: "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God. And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together."

Mr. Foster fatally erred in his argument, because of the falsity of his premise. He asserts the continuity of the relation of children to God; Christ denies it, for the reason that man has voluntarily destroyed that relation. The premise being false, his whole argument falls to the ground.

The second argument which Mr. Foster deduced from the paternity of God is this: If an earthly parent would compass all the means in his power to save his child, God, whose love is infinitely greater, and whose power is infinite, will ultimately bring all mankind to him. He says, God is not as good to his children, as we are to ours, unless he

shall thus save them all. This, he took care to tell us, was "one of the strongest links in the chain of his argument." If that is so, so much the worse for the chain. This argument is not only illogical, but worse. It compels us to impeach God's goodness; for according to it, an earthly parent is far more tender in his love for his children than the Divine Being himself. Look at the facts. No human being has ever yet lived, or ever will live, who has not suffered more or less from afflictions, which any good earthly parent would have prevented, had it been in his power. What parent would have his child born blind, or deaf and dumb, or a cripple? What parent would not prevent the sickness of his child if he had the power to do it? Who, if he had the power to prevent it, would suffer his child to endure all the evils that befall us all through life? What community is there that would not rejoice to wipe out, at one stroke, all the unnumbered calamities of our race? Yet God, who is infinitely better than the best of our race, and has the power, does not prevent these evils. Why is it, that if God would prevent the evils that would befall us in the future world, as a punishment for sins that we have committed, he will not prevent the evils that afflict us to to-day? Let Mr. Foster answer this question. On his hypothesis, the inevitable conclusion is, that God, who does less for man, than man would do for his kind, if he had the power, loves man less than man loves

his fellow man. God loves less than man loves! Will Mr. Foster thus impeach God? Yet he must show the contrary, or abandon his position. His whole argument condemns God, for not preventing, by means of his infinite power, the evils and sufferings which so greatly afflict the human race.

But, it is a rule in polemics, that any hypothesis is wrong, whose logical deductions conflict. It is for Mr. Foster to show that these deductions are illogical, that I have made from his hypothesis; namely: that if God's love would compel him to prevent future suffering as a punishment for sin, it would likewise compel him to prevent the sufferings that belong to the temporal state.

His is a one-idea doctrine. He takes one of God's perfections, and ignores all the rest, which are just as important, and just as essential to the divine character. He sees God's love, but ignores his holiness and justice. He quotes Malachi, ii. 2, "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?" but he does not exclaim with Isaiah: "The Lord Jehovah is our judge; the Lord is our law-giver; the Lord is our King!" He sees not the living creatures before the throne, full of eyes, showing their wonderful intelligence, and crying continually and forever, Holy, Holy, Lord God, Almighty!" He appeals to our idea of God's love, as if God had no *conscience*. Holiness is ascribed to God oftener than any other attribute named in the scriptures.

The love of God is a holy love—a love of holiness; is not that true? If so, his character is opposed to sin. It is a truism, that God must be opposed, by nature, to whatever is opposed to his nature. It belongs to the very nature of things, that just as any being loves one thing, whatever that thing may be, in the same proportion he hates its opposite. God can not love holiness, without hating sin just in the same proportion that he loves holiness. We know also by observation, that the more holy and the more like God a man becomes in this life, the more he hates sin. This is not only a matter of principle, therefore, but also a matter of fact. It is a matter of revelation also. Jesus said, "If a man love the one he will hate the other; ye can not serve God and mammon." It follows, that God having infinite love for holiness, has infinite hatred for sin.

Now, let me give you another principle that no thinking man can gainsay, and which ought to make every man tremble who will not repent, and obey the gospel of the Son of God. The conscience of every intelligent being will sanction the infliction of penalty upon the transgressor, just in proportion to the opposition of his nature to the transgression. If Mr. Foster, for instance, is not opposed to sin; if he does not hate sin, he will oppose its punishment; but if God is opposed to sin in an infinite degree, corresponding to the infinite holiness of the character of God, then he will punish sin accordingly. "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the

living God!" The only means that infinite love has provided for man's redemption, is set forth in Rom. iii. 24–26: "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." That is the only means that God's infinite love has provided for man's escape from the consequences of his sins—by his coming to the blood of Christ, and receiving pardon through that blood.

But Mr. Foster's argument from the love of God, if it proves any thing, proves too much. It is like the darkey's steer, that when it began to jump, jumped so high that it killed itself. Mr. Foster's argument kills itself outright, to all intents and purposes, if he does not show wherein this argument does not hold good with respect to temporal suffering, as well as to eternal punishment. If God does not, in his great and infinite love, prevent suffering here, how do you know he will do so hereafter? You say he changes not. Then, as he here punishes men in this life, by the laws of nature, for even a violation of physical laws, how do you know he will not punish them in the life to come, for violations of his divine law? You say that in the next world, God's love will be so overwhelming, that the

sinner will be constrained to accept salvation. How do you know that? If God designs to overwhelm men in that manner, why does he not overwhelm them here in the same manner, and bring them, while here on earth, to accept the offers of salvation? Has he not the power to do it? Is there anything in the physical nature of man that prevents it here? Is man's body in the way? If that be true, then God is not omnipotent. If his purpose is to compel man by his great love to accept the offer of the divine favor, he can do it as well here, as in the next state. By ignoring the only terms of salvation that God has pointed out, and by this declaration which he makes in regard to another state of probation after this, he is blinding the eyes of men, and leading them on through this, the only state of probation that God has ever intimated they should enjoy, until they plunge thus blinded, and thus deluded, into that awful eternity for which they might have been prepared, had it not been for this subterfuge of lies. The responsibility is his—if he desires to take it upon him—if he is prepared to promise to his fellow men a future state of probation, that God has not promised, and of which there is not even the slightest intimation, from the first letter of divine revelation to the last, he must be permitted to do it. It is a fearful responsibility; let him take it if he will. Why does he not show us the scripture for this additional state of probation? If he can, why does he not do it?

He professes to adhere closely to the subject, and says he will not suffer himself to be drawn away from it, by any thing that I shall say. I therefore ask him to answer this question—why did he not give us the scripture for his next probationary state?

It is, therefore, clear, both from scripture and reason, that, though in relation to creation and providence, God is the Father of all; yet he is also the sovereign ruler and judge of all men. It is equally clear, in the second place, that the moral actions of men with respect to obedience, or to rebellion against the divine government, are free and unrestrained. And in the third place, that it is perfectly in keeping with the character of God, and with his paternity and goodness, for God, in the character of judge, to inflict the punishment threatened in the Bible upon the sinner, or to grant the promised salvation through repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. That infliction may be made in perfect consistency with the divine nature—it may be made eternal, and there is no evidence whatever to show that it is not, and much to show that it is.

I have now carefully examined every phase of the argument advanced under the head of the divine paternity—of the paternal love of God, although I did not see fit to follow Mr. Foster in the precise order in which he advanced them. "God's paternal love," would have been a better statement of his proposition, and as such I have answered his argument.

You will observe that all the argument presented by the affirmative here—all the proof advanced under this head—was directed to the admitted doctrine of the fatherhood and love of God. In proof of this fatherhood, and of this love of God, Mr. Foster quoted a large amount of scripture; but in proof of his doctrine, that all men will be finally holy and happy, drawn from the fatherhood and love of God, he gave us none. What did he quote Psalms lxxxix. for? He attaches so much importance to Psalms lxxxix. that he has repeated it here to-night. I will read the lxxxix Psalm, and hope to show you the utter falsity of his position. I read the entire paragraph, in which occurs the verse quoted by Mr. Foster, to prove the doctrine of restoration after a limited punishment, the 33d verse. "Then thou spakest in vision to thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I annointed him: with whom my hand shall be established; mine arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him: nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him; and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my

salvation. Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him forevermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from *him*, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail."

This 33d verse cannot be misunderstood, when it is allowed to stand with the context. The meaning is perfectly plain. It is just as if my children should do wrong at school—the teacher will punish them for their misdoing, but will still retain his friendly relations toward me. Mr. Foster would have you believe that the 33d verse, which promises that God's goodness shall not be wholly taken away, and the context, which threatens God's judgments for sin, refer to the same persons. The rebellious children are to be visited with the rod and with stripes, while David, their father, was to enjoy the favor of God. That is the plain, simple meaning of this passage, to which he attaches so much importance.

The next passage that he quoted, was Isaiah lvii. 16. I will ask you to look at the whole of the paragraph, beginning with the 13th verse, and see if any support for the doctrine of universal salva-

tion can be tortured out of that. "When thou criest, let thy companions deliver thee; but the wind shall carry them all away; vanity shall take them: but he that putteth his trust in me, shall possess the land, and shall inherit my mountain; and shall say, cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way; take up the stumbling-block out of the way of my people. For thus saith the high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy, I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones. For I will not contend forever, neither will I always be wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."

Upon this declaration—"the spirit would fail before me," Mr. Foster hypothecated the statement, that the soul of man could not endure eternal punishment. If God had determined that he would punish a being forever, could he not give that being such a nature as would endure forever in endless misery? The simple explanation of this passage, is this; that while there are certain humble and contrite souls against whom Jehovah says he will not contend forever, because they would fail before him, would sink in despair, not *would be annihilated*, as he would fain have you believe; but would *fail* before him, it has no reference whatever, to the impenitent sinner, and gives him no ground to hope for escape from the just punishment that

awaits the impenitent. What his condition is, is graphically described in the context immediately following this passage. We have here in close connection, the condition of the repenting and unrepenting sinner described, of which Mr. Foster himself is very well aware. Let us read on a little further, and make this matter clear. "For the iniquity of his covetousness was I wroth, and smote him, I hid him and was wroth, and he went on frowardly in the way of his heart; I have seen his ways and I will heed him; I will lead him also, and restore comforts unto him, and to his mourners. I create the fruit of the lips; peace, peace to him that is afar off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord; and I will heal him." This is so far descriptive of those who repent and turn to God. Now we go on a little further: "But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." Thus much in reference to his texts of scripture. Read them over when you go home, and read them carefully, and see if I have misread them.

Mr. Foster, therefore, has not proved his position by his argument on the paternal love of God. He has not proved it by scripture; for he has given us no scripture in proof. Every argument—every attempt that he has made to prove it from reason, impeaches the holiness and justice of God; and besides, his reasons are in conflict not only with scripture, but with themselves.

744469 A

Mr. Foster's next argument, based upon the foreknowledge of God is very short. He offers no scripture in proof of his argument, but much in proof of his basis. It would have been in good play if orthodoxy denied the foreknowledge of God; but inasmuch as it asserts that doctrine, his reasoning does not apply. Human reason cannot fathom the subject of the divine foreknowledge. Said Mr. Foster, "God would not have created any single creature for eternal woe." Again he says, "But if any creature shall suffer eternal woe, God foreknew it, and therefore foreordained it." Here he places himself in this dilemma—angels are God's creatures. Look at Gen. ii. 1, if you want the proof. Job says they are the sons of God—Job xxxviii. 7. Hear what Jude says concerning angels, in the 6th verse of his epistle to the churches: "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." Here, then, is what is being done at this very time with some angels; they are reserved in everlasting chains. The devil, is a fallen angel, as we believe, but he is not chained; though he will be at the millenium. Just now he is going about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour. God created the devil and his angels in another state, not devils, but intelligent free agents; and by their own will, they kept not their first estate. There is an everlasting fire prepared for the devil

and his angels, and John, in his vision of the closing scenes of time, says, "I saw the devil," (the being whom Mr. Foster would have you believe must be annihilated by his punishment, for his crime against God) "that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." Rev. xx. 10. When is this annihilation to take place in the case of the devil? It must be after the end of "forever and ever."

But, says Mr. Foster, "God must restore all his creatures to a state of happiness and holiness, or else be guilty of a depth of infamy in comparison with which the deeds of Nero, Caligula and Robespierre sink into utter insignificance." Shall the devil and his angels be restored to holiness and happiness, or shall God be branded with greater infamy than that of Nero or Caligula? Which horn of the dilemma will Mr. Foster take? I hope he will make a note of that, and tell us whether the devil is to come up with his angels from the "everlasting fire" prepared for him. I would like for him to tell us whether he still adheres to that doctrine, that "every creature of God is to be restored to final happiness and holiness." We want to know whether God created the devil, or the devil God. Mr. Foster must prove that angels are not God's creatures, or he must take the consequences. If God would create angels, and punish them eternally for sins, that according to Mr. Foster he made

them commit, why will he not deal in the same way with creatures who are a little lower than the angels? If this is sophistry, (you remember, no doubt, that he had a good deal to say about sophistry)—if this is sophistry, it is possible for Mr. Foster to show the sophism; and I trust he will take pains to point it out.

Is it not hazardous for man, with his limited powers, to set up a standard by which to weigh the prescience of the Infinite? Had Mr. Foster not better have paused, and weighed well the consequences, before saying that because God foreknew all that should come to pass, he therefore foreordained it? If that be true, God is the author of sin, and not only that, but he is, himself, the only sinner in the universe. Then the devil, and all the abominable beings whose crimes have stained the earth with blood, and blackened the pages of human history, were but the involuntary instruments, through which God enacts his stupendous catalogue of crimes. If that be true, then Satan is as good and true a servant of God, as Gabriel. Then Nero, besmearing the christians with combustibles, and burning them by night in the gardens of his palace, while he drove his chariot by the light of the flames, and Domitian, who alone sent forty thousand christians to martyrdom—these cruel monsters were as faithful servants of God as was the apostle Paul, or any one of the devoted ministers of the gospel, in either ancient or modern times!

THIRD NIGHT.

MR. FOSTER'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

RESPECTED HEARERS:

Before proceeding with my affirmative argument, there are some things in Mr. Lozier's last speech, to which I desire to call special attention. And first, I will say I did not use the term *vile or abuse*, in alluding to his carricature of my doctrines. I wish to be reported correctly. I am glad, however, to note the fact, that he is disposed to be more serious, and to indulge less in levity and ridicule. If his doctrine be true, I wonder that he ever smiles, or tries to excite the mirthfulness of his audience. Endless torment! Just think of it! If true, there is not a family circle in all the land that will not be broken up! No one can fully realize the consequences of this doctrine, without feeling sad, wretched and melancholy.

You now see the result of this *two days'* delay in replying to my arguments. Those that I shall introduce to-night, will have to go unanswered,

which, perhaps, is the shortest way of getting rid of them.

Most of the passages introduced by Mr. Lozier, as an offset to my argument on the divine paternity, I readily grant, teach that men, by obedience, become characteristically children of God; and this I labored to prove at the time I presented the argument. But did he notice the main point in the argument? It was this, that God's love was the same in *nature* as that of good earthly parents, differing only in degree, being more infinite and enduring! That while the mother *may forget* her child, God has assured us that *he will not forget his children!* I quoted Psalms lxxxix. 30–33, where it is said, "If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; and if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquities with stripes. Nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from *him*, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail." Upon this Mr. Lozier makes a quibble, because in quoting from memory, I read the word "them" instead of "him," in the last verse. Either reading would hold equally good, so far as the argument is concerned. I quoted it, as indicating a *principle* of the divine government. That though God would punish his children, still he would not *utterly take away his loving kindness from them*, or suffer his *faithfulness to fail!* But who was David, the

"him" referred to? None other, than the person who slew the Hittite, that he might obtain his wife. David, who at one time was *in hell* in consequence of his wickedness. See Psalms cxvi. 3: "The sorrows of death compassed me about, the *pains of hell gat hold upon me!*" And again, in Psalms lxxxvi. 13, we read: "For great is thy mercy toward me; and thou hast *delivered my soul from the lowest hell!*" Here we have David *in hell*, and *delivered from hell*, and all *in this world!* Will Mr. Lozier tell us where there is a hell *lower* than *the lowest?* Our argument in either case, is good, whether applied to *David* or *his children*, that God will not "utterly take his loving kindness from them, or suffer his faithfulness to fail!"

But how does he meet the argument upon Isaiah lvii. 16: "For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth; for the *spirit would fail before me*, and the *souls that I have made?*" Simply by asking a question, "If God had *determined* that he would *punish a being forever*, could he not give that being such a *nature*, as would *endure forever in endless misery?*" For ought we know, God could have done so. But has he thus *determined?* We answer *no!* Why did not Mr. Lozier give us the proof of his assumption?

Upon this passage, it will be seen, that he abandons his doctrine of *free agency*, and accepts that of *foreordination*. So that his fine spun argument upon that subject becomes a nullity. Just think

of it! God *determining to punish a being forever*, and giving him a *nature* that would enable him to *endure endless misery!* What *worse* could the *devil himself do?* Let us not mock the character of God thus, and believe him capable of such cruelty and injustice! He refers to the closing part of the chapter, where it is said, "But the wicked *are like the troubled sea*, when it cannot rest; whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There *is no peace* saith my God to the wicked." Did you note the *tense* when he quoted the passages? It does not say "the wicked *shall be like the troubled sea*," but "ARE" *already*, like the troubled sea! Nor is it said, there *will be no peace to the wicked finally;* but "*there is no peace to the wicked!*" *Now, right here!* This is what he means! No reference at all to the future world!

But Mr. Lozier says, what parent would not prevent sickness, and all other evils, if he had the power? Hence, he argues, that we make earthly parents better than God. He overlooks the fact, that the present is but an embryo state—that "man was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in *hope*." That sin, and all other evils, are but permissions of God's providence, which are ultimately to be overcome with good. The argument of Mr. Lozier upon this point, is that of the Deist and Atheist, who will cite you in proof of their systems to the sin and evil in the world! and

failing to harmonize these with their ideas of a perfect God, they throw aside revelation altogether. And thus, in his zeal to demolish Universalism, does Mr. Lozier join hands with the infidel in undermining the beautiful superstructure of the christian religion. But take another view of this subject. Sin, evil, pain, and death are in the world. How came they here? They must exist either in accordance with, or against God's will and pleasure. I take the ground that they are here in harmony with the divine will; and though God does not *compel* men to sin, yet for wise reasons he has exposed them to temptation, and subjected them to imperfection. Will Mr. Lozier take the ground that they exist against God's will and purpose? Such an argument would be fatal to his own hopes of happiness in the future world. If the evils, which he specifies, exist in the present world *against God's will*, they may exist against God's will in the future world, and afflict any and all beings! To show the suicidal nature of Mr. Lozier's argument, let us view it from another stand point. He contends that wicked men are not punished in this life, or so little, that it hardly deserves the name of punishment. That they are happy and prosperous here; and all this, *against God's will!* What is to prevent them from becoming *equally happy* in the *future state?* It will not do to say, that God has *willed* or *purposed* a different state of things *there!* His will can as easily be thwarted in that world as this! But the

fact is, God's will is supreme. "He worketh *all things* after the counsel of his *own will!*" "He doeth *according to his will*, in the army of heaven, and *among the inhabitants of earth!*"

But Mr. Lozier says, we make God the author of sin and evil, and in fact, according to our system, he is the only sinner in the universe! We have already told you how God is the author of evil, and why it is permitted. We now turn his attention to some plain testimonies upon the subject. In Isaiah xlv. 7, we have this strong language: "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace *and create evil. I the Lord do all these things!!*" In Amos iii. 6, language equally forcible is employed: "Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? Shall *there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?*" Let Mr. Lozier notice these passages, and what I have said upon the subject. Ah! but he will want *two days* to prepare his reply, and doubtless the aid of some of his brethren, before he can remove our argument.

He quotes another passage that I introduced, and tells you that certain parts of it were *emphasized*, and the rest hastily passed over. John iii. 16, "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotton Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." That the emphasis was placed upon the phrase "*so loved*," to to the neglect of the latter part of

the verse, "that whosoever *believeth* in him should not *perish* but have *everlasting life!*" Now the great trouble with Mr. Lozier is, that a phrase always means the same thing, wherever it occurs. The words "*eternal life*," or "*everlasting life*," *always* means a *state of bliss* in the *immortal world!* To *be saved*, *always* means deliverance from some *awful calamity in the eternal world! Hell always* means *a place of torment in the future state!* Now he knows better than this—if he does not, he ought to. These words and phrases are always to be determined by the connection in which they stand recorded, as well as by reference to parallel passages. The phrases "eternal life," "everlasting life," "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven," are used in a limited sense, in nine cases out of ten. In fact, it is doubtful, if there is more than one or two passages, where they are at all applicable to the future state. John says, "This *is life eternal*, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 3. In Luke xvii. 20, 21, we read, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, lo here! or lo there! for behold, the *kingdom of God is within you!*" Again, in Rom. xiv. 17, we have this testimony, "For the *kingdom of God* is not meat and drink, but *righteousness* and *peace*, and *joy in the Holy Ghost!*" In the passage under consideration, the words, "*everlasting life*" and "*perish*" occur in anthesis. Mr. Lozier

assumes that the term *perish* is synonymous with *endless punishment!* Let us take a few examples, and try Mr. Lozier's rule of interpretation. In Deut. xxviii. 20, Moses said to the people, "The Lord shall send upon thee, cursing, vexation and rebuke * * * until thou be *destroyed*, until thou *perish quickly!*" Can *endless torment* be endured *quickly?* In Jer. x. 11, we read, "The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they *shall perish!*" But does Mr. Lozier believe that the *wooden* and *silver gods* of the heathen are to suffer *endless torment!*" And yet such an absurdity is involved in his rule of interpretation. In Job xxxiv. 15, the prophet says, "*All flesh shall perish together!*" But did he mean to teach the doctrine of *universal damnation* in the passage? According to Mr. Lozier's definition of the term "perish," there is no avoiding this conclusion. But according to Isaiah, even the "*righteous perisheth.*" Isaiah lvii. 1, he says, "The *righteous perisheth*, and no man layeth it to heart!" But are they to suffer *endless punishment?* Upon this rule of interpretation, we should make the Bible inconsistent and absurd throughout its teachings. The *perishing* in John was a state of moral death, darkness, and depravity—the opposite to the *everlasting life* enjoyed by the believer.

Mr. Lozier says in the next place, that John saw the devil whom I said was to be destroyed, cast into the pit and lake of fire, where he is to be "tormented forever and ever?" If the devil is to be

destroyed, he says it "must be some time *after the forever and ever.*"

Now, does not Mr. Lozier know that this being cast into the "pit and lake of fire," was a figure, denoting his *utter destruction!* Read the whole passage: "And the devil which deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the *beast* and *false prophet are*, and shall be tormented *day and night*, forever and ever!" Will Mr. Lozier pretend that there are *days and nights in eternity?* If not, why adduce this passage to prove the *endless torment* of the devil? The same figure expressive of torment, he will find in Isaiah xxxiv., where the judgment and destruction of Idumea is described: "For my sword shall be bathed in heaven; behold it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse to *judgment.* * * * And the streams thereof shall be turned into *pitch*, and the dust thereof into *brimstone*, and the land thereof shall become as burning pitch. It shall not be quenched *night nor day;* the smoke thereof shall go up *forever and ever!*" But even after all this, we are told that the "*cormorant* and the *bittern* shall possess it; the *owl* also, and the *raven* shall dwell in it!" Surely this language is not applicable to the future state. Why, then, apply the figure of the Revelator to that state, when his metaphor was the same employed by the prophets?

While upon the destruction of the devil, will Mr. Lozier tell us which one of the many devils

we read of in the Bible, it is, that is to be *cast into this lake of fire? Judas* was called a *devil!* Peter was called a *satan!* and we find mention made of various other devils. Was it *Judas?* or *Peter?* or some one else, that was to be cast into this lake of fire? Give us some light on this subject, Mr. Lozier. The word *devil* is from the Greek word *diabolos*, and means, simply, *adversary—false accuser*, etc. The opposers of the Savior, and his religion, were *devils*, and were referred to as such in the sacred record.

Thus much in reply to Mr. Lozier's last speech. Had he replied to me at once, upon each evening, instead of waiting *two days*, I should not have had to consume time, that should have been devoted to the presentation of new arguments. Some *thirteen* arguments, that I had intended presenting, will have to be omitted, unless I have an opportunity of introducing them under the second proposition, in the form of an *alibi*, or negative testimonies against the doctrine of endless punishment.

My last argument that I shall have the privilege of presenting under this proposition, is predicated upon the *resurrection of the dead.* That all mankind will be raised from the dead, is a proposition that no one will deny. In fact, this is the corner stone upon which christianity is based. The only difference of opinion is, as to the results of the resurrection. Shall the resurrection result in a life unending and glorious, for the whole human family,

or will a part be raised as subjects of God's infinite wrath and vengeance? That all mankind will be raised from the dead, and be made like unto the angels, happy and immortal, I firmly believe—while Mr. Lozier contends for the opposite sentiment, that of the endless suffering of myriads of the subjects of the resurrection. But what do the scriptures teach? Turn to 1st Cor. xv. 21: "For since by man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam *all die*, even so in Christ shall *all be made alive!*" The same *all* who die in Adam, are to be made *alive in Christ!* See also the testimony from verse 23d to 28th: "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at at his coming. *Then cometh the end*, when *he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God*, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign till he hath *put all enemies* under his feet. The *last enemy* that shall be *destroyed, is death!*" Or leaving out the *supplied* words, this verse should read as it does in the original: "The *last enemy shall be destroyed*, DEATH!" He then says, "For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. All when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that *God*

may be all in all!" Here the apostle speaks of the destruction of *all enemies*, including *death*, which is the last! Where then, will there be any opposing element to man's happiness? Where then, will be the devil, who figures so conspicuously in Mr. Lozier's speeches? *All enemies destroyed! God, all in all!* This is the grand ultimatum that is to follow the resurrection of all who die in Adam! They are to be made holy and happy!

But the Apostle goes farther, and makes the argument more complete. Turn to the 35th verse, "But some man will say, how are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" You will mark the fact, there is no inquiry as to *how men die?* "But *how are they raised up?*" This was the particular point of inquiry. The Apostle then proceeds with the answer, and in the 42d verse says, "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in *corruption*, it is raised in *incorruption*. It is sown in *dishonor*, it is raised *in glory*; it is sown in *weakness*, it is raised in *power;* it is sown a natural body, it is raised a *spiritual body*. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, the first man, Adam, was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also

that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And *as we have borne the image of the earthy*, we *shall also bear the image of the heavenly!*" Here the predicate of the *heavenly image*, is the fact that we have borne the *image of the earthy!* As many as have *died in Adam*, as many as have borne *the image of the earthy*, are to be made alive in Christ, and to bear the *image of the heavenly!* But Mr. Lozier contends that there is to be no change after death—that as "death leaves us, so judgment finds us"—that if we *die sinners*, we shall be *raised up sinners*, and continue in sin and suffering through the endless ages of the future. But the whole scope of the Apostle's argument is to show that there will be *a great, a wonderful change!* That our relations to the spiritual world will be entirely different from what they are in the present existence. That *here*, we are surrounded by all the elements of imperfection and corruption—while *there*, we shall be freed from all such influences, and be prepared to enter upon a higher, purer, and more glorious state of being! He concludes his argument by declaring emphatically that there shall be a change after death. Verses 50th to the 57th, "Now this I say brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but *we shall all be changed!* In a moment, in the twinkling of an

eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be *raised incorruptible*, and *we shall be changed!* For this *corruptible* must put on *incorruption*, and this *mortal* must put on *immortality*. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up* in victory." Isaiah xxv. 6–8. He ends his argument, with the triumphant exclamation, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which hath given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." The argument of the apostle is complete, and needs no comment. There is no escaping the conclusion, that it embodies the resurrection of all mankind to a state of immortal blessedness and peace. And until Mr. Lozier can prove that an *incorruptible* and an *immortal being* can *sin* and *suffer*, our proposition will stand in full force and effect. In Matt. xxii. 22–32, we have also strong testimony in confirmation of that already adduced. "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him saying, Master, Moses said, if a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were with us seven brethren, and the first when he had married a wife, deceased; and having no issue, left his wife

unto his brother. Likewise, the second also, and the third unto the seventh. And last of all, the woman died also. Therefore, in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven, for they all had her. Jesus answered, and said unto them, ye do err, *not knowing the scriptures*, nor the *power of God!* For *in the resurrection*, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, *but are as the angels in heaven!*" See also parallel passages in Mark xii. 18–27. Luke xx. 35–38. The question of the Saducees had reference to the resurrection of *the dead* in general, without respect to persons or parties. No reference is had to two classes. Hence the Savior says, "In *the resurrection*, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but *are as the angels in heaven!*" Angels in heaven are *holy* and *happy*; therefore, such is to be the condition of *all* who are *subjects of the resurrection!*

But my time is out. I leave my argument in the hands of the audience, trusting that you will duly consider the testimonies presented, and their bearing upon the proposition under discussion. I have no idea that Mr. Lozier will attempt a reply, as his rule of *two days* preparation, forbid it.

MR. LOZIER'S THIRD REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

In the beginning of Mr. Foster's speech, on the last evening of discussion, it will be remembered that he excited his audience to the stamping point, by reiterating my remark about the "first Universalist preacher," Cain and Abel, Pharaoh, the Canaanites, and so on, and alluding also to the verses I read in the course of my first speech. He concluded, by saying that those verses were not original, and that he had the whole speech, almost, in Hall's "Universalism Against Itself," as also the poetry. I wish simply to say, that up to the time I made that speech, I had not seen the book for half a dozen years. My attention was called to the verses by a cherished friend, and a minister of the Presbyterian church, and at the time were distinctly credited by me to another author. As to the other things in my speech, which he says are in that book, he is mistaken. I find, however, since that time, that Hall, in that book, does speak of the Sodomites, Noah, and the Canaanites, as they occur in the scripture record; but the assertion he made, that I employed either the language of that book, or anything contained in it except the verses, is an assertion that can be made good, if true; and I have, for that purpose, brought the manuscript containing my remarks, and also the book, (which I have succeeded in procuring since

the occasion referred to,) and I desire Mr. Foster to take them both, and point out to you the remarks that I made, and which, as he said, were borrowed from that book. I will consent, on my part—and the judges will, no doubt, do so too—that he shall have full time to do this, without curtailing the time allowed him for the discussion. If he succeeds in doing so, he will prove me to be a plagiarist; if he fails to do so, then I will ask him to be so good as to favor us with a brief homily upon a passage of scripture contained in Exodus xx., which reads: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

Mr. Foster says, the doctrine the devil preached to Eve, in the garden of Eden, is the same kind of a doctrine that I preach: "*In the day that thou eatest thereof*, thou shalt surely die." By reference to the passage, Gen. ii. 16, 17, you will find that Moses does not attribute these words, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," to the devil, but to the Lord God. There is a slight difference of opinion, upon that point, between Moses and Mr. Foster. I believe, under all the circumstances, I prefer the authority of Moses. Mr. Foster says, the devil used the language, but Moses says it was God that used it. The devil told Eve that God lied, and Mr. Foster repeats it. So, if the devil did not preach Universalism, the Universalist preaches devilism!

He says, that if Jeff. Davis repented and became

a christian, I would have to associate with him. We admit, that if he came to heaven washed from his sins, and made white in the blood of the lamb, we would have to treat him as we would any other redeemed sinner; but Mr. Foster intends to bring him there independently of the blood of Christ, and compel us to fellowship and associate with him forever, just as he is. That is the difference.

He alludes to my assertion, that the scriptures do not teach the doctrine, nor intimate it, of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, from the beginning of Genesis to the end Revelation, as being a mere assertion. He says, "Let him prove it." For an old debater, this is tolerably cool. What is the rule that prevails in all discussions of this kind? It is, that the burden of proof rests with the affirmant. If I am incorrect in this, certainly the Moderators will correct me. He has the affirmative, and I the negative. He affirms a thing to be so, which I deny; and then he cries out, "Let him prove it." Well, I will prove it, if he will listen till I read the whole Bible through; for that is the only way I know of to prove that a thing is not in the Bible. It is not incumbent upon the negative to show anything of the kind.

Now we come to examine Mr. Foster's fourth argument, based upon the fact, admitted by all parties before the discussion began, that God is the creator and ruler of the universe; but which fact, he laboriously and extensively quoted scripture to

prove. No sooner does he announce the basis of his argument, than he launches out at once into the boundless sea of fatalism. He says that God designs the final happiness of all his intelligent creatures, and will have no one thwart his designs. And says further, that if God should not do this, he would be guilty of greater infamy than that of Nero, Caligula or Robespierre. But this is not the only thing he says. He asserts that God designs all that comes to pass. If that be true, he can with propriety repeat his impious assertion that God is worse than the tyrants of old; for upon that ground, it would be easy to demonstrate that God is just as much worse than those men, as the assassin is worse than the knife he uses; for they are only instruments in the hands of the Almighty. Mr. Foster's view, if it be correct, places God's character and conduct in glaring antagonism. Every perfection of the Deity is opposed by his own acts. God is love; yet he has made millions of men to hate him, and to hate his Son, and has filled the devil, and all his angels, with hatred to God and man. God is holy; but he has caused millions to burn with lust, and revel in debauchery and licentiousness. God is just; yet he has made millions to groan and writhe beneath the crushing heel of injustice and oppression. God is merciful, and shows his mercy in its fulness, by raising up the traitor, the murderer, the robber, the gambler, the seducer, and the drunkard maker, to destroy the lives, property, and happiness of mankind.

Now, Mr. Foster is to prove his proposition by scripture and reason. If his reasoning is correct, and the scriptures are also correct, then God not only opposes his own nature by his actions, but punishes the instruments of his own infamy, for executing his irresistible decrees. For, be it remembered, Mr. Foster says, every transgressor shall endure, in his own person, the full punishment prescribed, and there is no avenue of escape whatever. Now, will Mr. Foster please to make a note of this, and answer this one question to-night: If God ordains man to commit every sin that he commits, on what principle of justice does he inflict this punishment?

Furthermore, this theory of Mr. Foster's, degrades the Bible. If God ordains every act of virtue, or of vice, that man commits, then his written word is a mere mockery of man's helplessness, and a tissue of hypocrisy from beginning to end—a collection of precepts and laws, of promises and penalties, promulgated by Jehovah to millions of men, whom he had foreordained should treat it with derision and contempt!

Another of Mr. Foster's inconsistencies is this On his theory, God has ordained him to preach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, whether they will or no; while me, he has ordained to preach the final holiness and happiness of those only who, by hearty repentance and true faith, come to God through Jesus Christ. God has or-

dained the preaching of both these doctrines, and he has ordained that we should both believe them. He has not only ordained our belief, but he has also ordained what all these people shall believe. Hence, according to that doctrine, we are, neither of us, responsible for what we believe, or capable of affecting the belief of each other, or of any of our hearers. God has foreordained what they shall believe.

He said, I was guilty of unchristianlike conduct and so on. He should remember that God has foreordained whatever should come to pass—I could not help it. If his theory is correct, he is spending a greal of study and time in a bootless business, for all is foreordained, and nothing can come of it.

We know that the lower order of beings, the brute creation and inanimate nature, moves in complete obedience and subserviency to the will of God. If man is under the same involuntary control, why are the actions of men's lives—their conduct—so discordant? God must have a multitude of wills, all operating in different directions, and it must be a grave question to settle, which of his wills will come out ahead at last.

He quoted from the lxxxix. Psalm, where God promised not to take away his loving kindness from David. He still holds to his doctrine of fatality. At first he said, they must be punished for their rebellion against God; now he says, never-

theless, finally God will make all his people happy. In the same connection, he quotes Paul to the Hebrews, in proof of the position that the devil is to be destroyed. He represents here to-night that God was the great first cause of all things, devil and all. John says ALL things were made by him. Hence we have these three propositions. First, the devil is to be destroyed. Second, the devil is one of God's creatures; and thirdly, as every creature of God is included in his scheme, the devil is to be finally holy and happy.

Mr. Foster continues, and says that all are not now obedient servants unto God, and many may not die such, but that this will not prove that they may not become so hereafter. Here is his hell-redemption theory again. He quoted the sayings of Christ, that "Love is the fulfilling of the law," and that "not one jot nor one tittle of the law should pass till all be fulfilled." Observe, that God does not say that not a jot nor tittle should pass till all fulfill the law, but until all be fulfilled. Now we all recognize the fact as true, that the laws are fulfilled in this community; but that does not imply that there are none who break them. While there are some who violate the laws of the land, there are those who fulfill them, and therefore we would say that the laws are fulfilled. They are fulfilled by those who do fulfill them. But, granting Mr. Foster's assumption for the sake of the argument, what have we then? Simply this—

that all men are to be brought to love God supremely, and their neighbor as themselves, and that change is to take place sometime between their exit from earth, and their entrance into heaven. This remarkable change is to be brought about by punishment—there is to be a sort of sulphurous reform school, in which God will punish the wicked until they love him and each other, and thus become fit subjects for heaven. All the wicked are to depart, accursed, into "everlasting fire" and stay there until they not only love God, but their neighbor too—all will be neighbors there—the devil and his angels, as well as all wicked men; hence before any man can ever escape from that place he must have learned to love the devil, whose machinations got him into that place of torment. We read that there is to be a "beast" there, and a "false prophet"—probably several of them. Turn to the prohecy of Ezekiel, chapter xiii. and you will find that it is made up largely of denunciations of God's vengeance upon false prophets. God there speaks in this wise: "Son of man, prophesy against the prophets of Israel that prophesy, and say unto them that prophesy out of their own hearts; hear ye the word of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord God; Wo unto the foolish prophets that follow their own spirits and have seen nothing." The cause for which this woe is pronounced on these false prophets, is stated in the 22d verse: "Because with lies ye have made the heart of the

righteous sad, whom I have not made sad." That is only a part of it; hear the rest: "and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." Suppose now, sir, that you and I, by our preaching, should cause some one to go there, or many men to go there—and should finally go there ourselves, and meet these unfortunate victims of our false phrophecies, do you not think it would take a good deal of fire and brimstone to make them love us?

Mr. Foster referred also, to Rom. xiii. 9, "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not kill; Thou shalt not bear false witness; Thou shalt not covert; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." He quoted only a part of this passage. I give you the whole. Next comes his quotations of God's promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and their families. What was this promised seed of Abraham? It was the Lord Jesus Christ. The gospel of Chrsst is just such a blessing as was promised by God to all the nations and families of the earth. In it all the families of the earth have been blessed. It has made the wilderness to rejoice, and the desert to blossom like the rose. Wherever it goes it blesses the whole people. What is it that makes America different from heathen lands to-day? It is the in-

fluence of the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and nothing else. We enjoy no blessing as a people, or as individuals, which cannot be traced directly to christianity as its source. Show me a human being who is not blessed and benefitted through christianity, and I will then consider the argument further.

Mr. Foster's fifth argument is based upon the will of God. He quoted Paul to Timothy, 1st Epistle, ii. 4, where the language occurs, with reference to God: "Who will have all men saved." He only read a part of this verse, as has been the case in many other instances; he makes off with this much of it before the rest of it overwhelms him. Let us have it all: "Who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." Mr. Foster says the term "will" means God's abstract will and purpose to save all men. We, on the other hand, understand it to refer to his desire that they should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. Had he meant the other, he would have said it; but he did not. He expresses simply his desire that all men shall be saved in the way that he has provided. He said: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life, and no man cometh unto the Father but by me." Do all men come to Christ—do all men come to the knowledge of the truth through him? If God *wills* it, they do, because it is his will. Christ said to the Jews: "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye

have eternal life;" but he also used this language to them: "But ye will not come to me that ye might have life." He *wished* them to come, but they *willed* not to come, and rejected life; for they rejected Christ, and Christ said, "No man cometh to the Father but by me." Mr. Foster says, however, that all men shall come to the Father, and many hope to come to God in some way or other. Christ says he is the only way, and if all men ever come to God, some of them must be the characters alluded to in John x. where Christ says, "If any man enter not by the door into the sheep-fold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." If a person who enters the earthly sheep-fold in any other way than by the door, is a thief and a robber, what kind of a person is the man who shall seek to get into heaven in any other way than that which God has prepared—through repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ?

But, says Mr. Foster, God willed all men to be saved, and Christ came to do the will of God in all things. Very well; but in Lev. xix. and xx. we learn that God also willed all men to be holy—holy in all things. Are they holy? Do they perfectly conform to the law of God? No. The language of inspiration is, that "God is not in all their thoughts." Yet God wills that they should be holy. Christ did the will of the Father, and was holy, but the world does not obey the will of God. The world is not holy.

Mr. Foster quotes the words of Christ addressed to the Father, as evidence that none are to be lost. And in quoting Christ's language, to prove universal salvation, he is very brief, as might naturally be expected. He has so many arguments pressing upon him, just at this point, that he does not give us the whole passage entire, but cuts it short. Here is his quotation from John xvii. 12: "Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scriptures might be fulfilled." That looks very well, standing alone; but let us read the context, beginning back at the 6th verse: "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word. Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee; for I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou has given me; for they are thine. And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them. And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. Whilst I was with them in the world, I kept them

in thy name." You see he is praying for his disciples. Now we come to Mr. Foster's quotation: "Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost." There Mr. Foster ends his quotation; but, unfortunately for his cause, the sentence does not end there; it goes on—"None of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scriptures might be fulfilled." Who was the "son of perdition?" Judas, was the son of perdition. It could not have been the devil, for he was not one of the "men whom thou gavest me." At all events, whether it was Judas Iscariot, or not, we have here one instance, at least, of one human being lost; and lost in the sense in which Mr. Foster declares men cannot be lost. If this son of perdition was a human being, then Mr. Foster is defeated; and that it was a human being, is clearly evident from the language of Christ, "The men whom thou gavest me out of the world," in which expression the son of perdition is evidently included. The parallel passages of scripture, indicate beyond doubt, that it was Judas. The margin refers to John xiii. 18: "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen: but that the scriptures may be fulfilled, he that eateth bread with me, hath lifted up his heel against me." This language is addressed by Christ to his disciples, and the reference is to Judas. The scripture which Christ speaks of as being fulfilled, is in Psalms xli. 9: "Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom

I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me." From these, the marginal reference is to Acts i. 16, where the Apostle Peter stood up, in the midst of the disciples, and said: "Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus. For he was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry." So, you see, Mr. Foster has introduced here, for the purpose of proving universal salvation, a passage of scripture which declares that the son of perdition should be lost. He has utterly failed to produce a single passage of scripture, that says all men shall be finally saved. After all his efforts, he has only succeeded in showing that one man, at least, was lost; and so long as a single human being is lost, his position cannot be maintained. He is to prove that all men are to be saved, and a solitary exception destroys his position.

Mr. Foster refers to a passage in 1st Corinthians, xv., for what, he says, is one of the Apostle Paul's most convincing arguments in favor of of the doctrine of universal salvation. I hope you will examine it. In the 22d verse, he says, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." But, does being "made alive," mean that all are to enjoy eternal happiness? No; it means precisely what it says. Let us read on a little further: "But every man in his own order: Christ

the first fruits; afterward, they that are Christ's at his coming." But who are "Christ's at his coming?" Paul says, in Rom. viii. 9: "If any man hath not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Turn now to Malachi, and read, beginning at the iii. 16: "Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another: and the Lord hearkened and heard it: and a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him. Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not. For behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear my name, shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall." From these passages, we see that those who die with the spirit of Christ in them, are to be his at his coming—they, and none others. We see, too, that there is to be a difference "between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not," Mr. Foster, and his Univer-

salist friends, to the contrary notwithstanding. What was the language that John heard from the lips of Christ, in Revelations xxii. 11? "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." If there is to be no difference between the righteous and the wicked, why did Christ say there was? In John v. 28, Christ says to the Jews: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." There is, then, to be a difference made between the righteous and the wicked; that one class are to be raised up unto life, and the other to damnation.

Mr. Foster quotes the language of Paul, where he says, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound," and thinks that even so, the grace of God will overwhelm sin, until it shall be totally destroyed. Even so, shall it be, in every penitent sinner's heart who seeks the help of God's grace. That is what that means, and all that it does mean.

In John iii. 14, occurs this language: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man be lifted up." In the verse following, we see the distinction which Mr. Foster failed to observe between the two classes of

persons: "That *whosoever believeth* in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." They that *believe* are to be saved. What is the unmistakable inference as to those who do not believe? I had hoped that Mr. Foster would answer my argument upon this point, on the language of this text, especially on the words whosoever believeth; but he ignored it, and I presume will continue to do so still. Instead of meeting it, and looking it fairly and squarely in the face, as a man ought to do, who feels that he is right, he attempts to get around it, and throw dust in your eyes by a quibble over the word "perish."

He quotes again, from the Apostle Paul: "Christ will reign until he has put all enemies under his feet." Undoubtedly so; but to say that all his enemies shall be put under his feet, does not mean that they are to be saints at his right hand.

He says, further, that the judgment is now going on, all the time, and quoted a number of passages of scripture, which, as he thought, effectually made away with the orthodox view of a day of judgment, yet to come. I need hardly say to you, that the subjects to which those passages relate, have no connection whatever with, nor any relation—even the most remote—to the question at issue in this discussion. But I want to ask him this question: If the judgment is now progressing, who is the judge? Christ judges no man. In John xii. 47, he says: "If any man hear my words, and believe

not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." It is evident that he was not judging these unbelievers then. But Paul, in Hebrews, ix. 27, tells us when this judgment takes place: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."

Mr. Foster quotes David, as saying, "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowermost hell;" and he seems to design to persude you that to be delivered from the lowermost hell means to have been there. Let us see. Says David, in Psalms cxvi., "Thou hast delivered my soul from death." Had David died when he composed this psalm? He says, in Psalms xviii. 5, "The sorrows of hell compassed me about; the snares of death prévented me." David had not been in hell, but he had been plunged into such misery as he calls the sorrows of hell, and the pains of death. I have seen persons in that same fix, many a time, notwithstanding the consolations of Universalism. I have had them send for me to pray God to deliver them from that hell, the existence of which they had denied, until the sorrows of hell compassed them about, and the snares of death prevented them.

Mr. Foster says I am giving support and encouragement to the deist and the atheist, by advocating the doctrine of endless punishment—that the doctrine I preach is the identical argument by which

infidels seek to overthrow the divinity of the Bible. I pointed you to the misery, and sin and wretchedness, that exist in the world around us, but I did not attribute their existence to God. Mr. Foster says that God foreordained all that comes to pass, and I simply said that if his position was true, the conclusion was inevitable that God was not the just, good, holy, kind and benevolent being he is represented to us in the Bible. The conclusions to which the position of Mr. Foster leads us, are therefore precisely the same held by infidels, atheists or deists. Hence he is giving them aid and comfort, and not we, as he would have you believe.

Again, he wants to know how it is, that if wicked men are permitted to prosper and spread themselves like a green-bay tree, in this life, they may not be permitted to prosper in the next world also. Well, I will tell him one thing that will prevent them, and that will be the limited amount of room that will be allotted them in the next world. They are welcome, so far as I am concerned, to all the prosperity compatible with the place, and with the weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, that shall be in that outer darkness into which they are to be thrown, unless they come to God and receive pardon through faith in Jesus Christ.

He says that the expression, "eternal life," or "everlasting life," like the phrase, "kingdom of God" and some other similar expressions, are used in nine cases out of ten, in the New Testament,

in a limited sense; for instance: "He that believeth, hath eternal life"—"the kingdom of God is within you," and so on. He says we must take these expressions in a limited sense, and not as applying to the future. Now we believe, that "he that believeth hath eternal life." We all subscribe to this scripture doctrine, that he that believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, begins to live from that moment, and though the body may die, the soul lives right on, and is living that eternal life right here upon earth, from the moment of his conversion. This is precisely what the text says. I cannot see the limited sense Mr. Foster speaks about.

In alluding to the saying of Christ, Luke xiii. 5, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish," he endeavored to make it appear that the word "perish" there, had some other meaning than that of eternal punishment for sin. Christ asked the persons to whom he addressed that language, whether they supposed that the Gallileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, or the men upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, were sinners above all other men; and answering the question himself, says, "I tell you nay; but unless ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." Can you believe that he meant by this that unless they repented they should lose their lives as these men had done, and that that was all he meant by the word perish? The idea is preposterous. God has not promised to those who repent and serve him, immunity from

persecution or any other calamity in this life; and more than that, God would not have sacrificed his only begotten and well beloved Son, who was in the bosom of the Father before the world was, in order to save anything but the soul of man. It was in order that the soul of man might not perish, that God sent his son into the world.

He said, that unless I can prove that there will be days and nights in the future world, my argument must fall to the ground. The reference is to Rev. xx. 10, where the devil and the beast, and the false prophet are said to be tormented forever and ever, in the lake of fire both *day and night.* He says, John in speaking of the heavenly Jerusalem, says there shall be no night there—consequently, there being no night in eternity, the torments pronounced on the beast and the false prophet cannot be in eternity, but in time; for they are said to be tormented, *day and night.* Now you will notice that when John says "there shall be no night there," he is speaking of the heavenly world, the new Jerusalem of which Christ is to be the light. Are we not told of outer darkness in the other place, as well as of day in heaven? Here then, we have day in heaven, and night in hell—both day and night in eternity. That is what he wanted me to prove.

In this chapter of Rev. xx. 10, we read, "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false

prophet *are*, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." This may serve to answer another query of Mr. Foster, as to who, and what this devil is, that is to be cast into the lake of fire and tormented forever and ever. It is "The devil that deceived them." It was not *Peter*, nor *John*, nor any body else, but "the devil that deceived them."

Mr. Foster's last argument was, one drawn from the resurrection of the dead, and the change that the Bible teaches us, shall then take place in us. He quoted from 1st Cor. xv. to show what that change would be. Paul says, alluding to the body, that "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power," and so on. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body; as we have borne the image of the earthy, so shall we also bear the image of the heavenly." He says that the object and aim of the apostle's argument is to show how wonderful and how complete will be the transformation; the change that we shall all undergo at the resurrection. I am willing to admit that; and then I want him to answer this one plain question, does not all that is here said, relate to the change of the body? Is there a word said in this whole passage, about any change taking place in the soul, at the resurrection? Let him answer that. The body, it will be changed; but the soul, the moral being, will remain in the same state precisely, that it was in at the moment of its separation from the body.

It seems to me, now, that in summing up this debate, you will have to conclude about as follows: Mr. Foster has undertaken to prove the final holiness and happiness of all mankind. In doing so, or in attempting to do so, he has set up God's paternal goodness and foreknowledge as a basis; and upon this, has assumed, that God should compel men to come to heaven at last, and be forever holy and happy, no matter how much they may be opposed to it. In this assumption, he ignores entirely the holiness of God, and his justice; and asserts that man can, by suffering for his sins, enter heaven at last, in defiance of right, without repentance or faith in Christ; and hence in absolute independence of the whole plan of salvation set forth in the gospel. He has garbled the scriptures to prove his doctrine. He has charged God with being a monster of inhumanity and vice. He has both saved the devil and destroyed him, by his reasoning; and has assumed another probation, for which he has failed to produce scripture proof. He has finally cut his own theological throat with the sword of the spirit, by quoting a passage of scripture that announces the loss of Judas Iscariot.

MR. FOSTER'S CLOSING SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

RESPECTED FRIENDS:

With this speech, I shall close my labors upon the first proposition. Had Mr. Lozier replied to my arguments, throughout this discussion, on the same evening they were presented, it would now be in my power to answer him more fully, than under existing circumstances, I shall be able to do. You now see, I have no doubt, if you did not see it before, the object he had in view in declining to meet the arguments, until two days after they were presented. It gives him, in effect, the advantage of closing the debate. As it is, however, he has delayed answering the most of my arguments until to-night, and I have but twenty minutes left in which to reply. In view of these facts, I shall have to confine myself to a few of the principal points contained in his last speech.

I object to being misrepresented so frequently before an audience. I never quoted John xvii. 12, as Mr. Lozier affirmed. The passage that I introduced in support of my proposition, was John vi. 38, 39, which reads as follows: "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that hath sent me. And this is the Father's will, which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." I told you how many were given to Christ by the Father—I

proved that all things were given into his hands—that all nations and kindreds of the earth, were his, by the gift of the Father; and that of all these, there were none to be lost! But Mr. Lozier strangely exults, or seems to exult, in finding *somebody who is going to be damned*, and quotes the passage in John xvii. 12, concerning Judas, where Christ, addressing the Father, says: "Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them *is lost* but the son of perdition." This is the passage he represented me as quoting for the purpose of making it appear that Christ said none should be finally lost. Examine, even this passage, for a moment, and what does it prove against the proposition? Who was the son of perdition? The gentleman says truly, it was Judas. But how was he lost? Not in the sense contended for by Mr. Lozier. He was lost as an apostle, and as a fellow co-worker with the rest of the apostles in the gospel ministry. Mark the use of the present tense of the verb, in this passage quoted by Mr. Lozier. "None of them IS LOST, but the son of perdition!" He does not say "none of them *will be lost*"—but "none of them *is lost!*" *Already lost!* There is no allusion whatever to Judas' future condition. The reference is to the loss of Judas from the number of our Lord's disciples. To suppose it to refer to his lost condition morally, is a strong argument in favor of his final salvation; for Christ "came to seek and to save those that *were lost!*"

Power sufficient was also delegated to him to enable him to accomplish the work. So the inspired phophet says of him: "He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." What can satisfy the loving heart of the Lord Jesus Christ, save the full and complete accomplishment of his mission, in the salvation of the world!

Mr. Lozier quoted the language of Ezekiel, "Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." I am willing to test our respective doctrines right here, by this identical passage of scripture. I am ready to submit the question, as to which of the two doctrines it is that "strengthens the hands of the wicked?" and which it is that makes "the heart of the righteous sad?" Does my doctrine make them sad? Are they made to mourn by the prospect of the final happiness of the whole human family? Ask the mother who has been called to part with her first-born; ask the father who has committed to the cold embrace of earth the son of his love—whether their hearts throb with anguish, when they think of meeting with their loved ones amid the undying glories of the heavenly world? Is there a father or mother here to-night, whose heart would be made sad by telling them of the better land, where they shall meet their dear ones to part no more forever, all

immortal, all happy—none lost—all saved through the merits of the Redeemer, basking in the sunlight of that divine love which knows no bounds? O, mock not the holiest affections of the human heart, by saying such a doctrine is calculated to make men sad!

What doctrine is it that makes the heart sad? Ask that father who has parted from his boy—who perchance, has been called into eternity, in the very moment of committing some crime against God—who has been hurried off the shores of time without a moment's warning—ask him, if his heart is not made sad by the doctrine which consigns that son to an eternity of torment? See the old man standing beside the open grave, his head bowed down with hopeless grief, and listen to his despairing cry—"O, my son, my son! would to God, I could hope to meet thee again! O, that I knew thou wert saved!" Ask him, if his heart is not sad, as he stands there, his heart wrung with anguish, and yearning for the salvation of his son, yet not reflecting, nor believing that that God, who is infinitely benevolent, has as much love as he has. The stream cannot rise higher than the fountain. The deepest and strongest love that animates the human heart, is but a feeble emanation from the infinite and all-pervading love of God. How many hearts are made sad from a failure to recognize this glorious truth! Go to the lunatic asylums of our land, and gaze upon the pitable wrecks of hu-

man intellect that have resulted from this doctrine of endless torment! How often, alas, has human reason been overwhelmed by the contemplation of endless woe! I have had some experience among this class, and my heart has often been pained to see the miseries man brings upon himself, by refusing to recognize the boundless love of God toward man.

What doctrine is it, that "strengthens the hands of the wicked?" Let us see. The language that the Lord God addressed to Adam in the garden of Eden, was: "*In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*" The apostle tells us, "The wages of sin *is death.*" The prophet says, "The way of the transgressor *is hard!*" This is Universalism. But Mr. Lozier's doctrine is, that all these penalties may be escaped, even at the eleventh hour, by repentance. Is not this the doctrine that "strengthens the hands of the wicked?" According to this doctrine, a man may be the worst sinner in the world—go on in sin for fifty years, without doing a solitary righteous act, or cherishing one holy purpose in all his life, and yet escape punishment altogether, and go to heaven at last! We had a case in point of quite recent occurrence—that of three men who were hung in Cincinnati, for murder, one of whom thanked God that he had committed the deed, as it had been the *means of his salvation!* Nor is there a crime upon the dark catalogue of transgression, that may not be com-

mitted with impunity, upon the hypothesis that Mr. Lozier's doctrine is true. Thus much upon this point

I have barldy time enough left to attempt a recapitulation of all my arguments, having been compelled to notice so much of Mr. Lozier's last speech. I shall only present them in brief outline, leaving the audience to refresh their minds with the testimonies already presented.

My first argument was predicated on the *paternity of God*, and the relation that he sustains to the human family. I showed you under this head, that God was a kind and infinitely loving Father—that his paternal love for his intelligent creatures far exceeds that of the best earthly parent. I called upon Mr. Lozier to show that he would change, or love his creatures any less than he does now. He has not given us the first testimony to substantiate such a sentiment; and the conclusion is therefore inevitable, that God will always be to us the same kind and loving Father that he is now; and so long as man has an existence, he will continue to be the object of God's paternal love and solicitude.

My second argument was based upon the *love of God!* I quoted numerous testimonies from the Bible, setting forth God's love for frail, sinful humanity—that it was this love that led him to devise the plan of salvation, and provide the means for the consummation of the same. That he gave

his Son an offering for the sins of the whole world! I called upon him to show that the love of God would *change*—that the time would ever come when he would cease to love his creatures with the intense and infinite love that he now has for them. He failed to do it. The conclusion therefore, is irresistible, that his love will result in the bringing of all souls to a perfect obedience to his will, and the requirements of his law.

My third argument was founded upon the *foreknowledge of God.* This argument like the rest, remains unanswered. He has not even attempted to set aside the evidence presented, or show that our deductions from the premises laid down, were not logical and conclusive in favor of the proposition.

The next argument I offered, was founded upon the fact that God is the *sovereign and rightful ruler of the universe;* and that as such, he was entitled to, and would finally receive the homage of all hearts. "The *kingdom is the Lord's*, and he is the governor among the nations!" I quoted line after line, and text after text, in support of my argument. I referred you to the testimony of the Psalmist "*All nations whom thou hast made* shall come and *worship before thee*, and *shall glorify thy name!*" We showed that the divine government was framed expressly for the final good of all intelligent beings, and that even the *penalties of the law*, were inflicted with reference to the same great object.

My sixth argument was founded upon the *promises of God.* I gave the testimony in Gen. xxii. 15–18, where the promise was made unto Abraham, and afterwards confirmed to Isaac and Jacob, that in him and his seed "*all nations and families should be blessed!*" Mr. Lozier sets this aside, however, by simply alluding to it as a promise of national blessings. But the promise cannot be restricted in this way—for the blessing is to extend to "*all the nations, kindreds,* and *families* of the earth!" And they are to be blessed by being "*turned away from their iniquities!*"

Mr. Lozier told you that I believed God would *compel* all men to believe, whether they were willing or unwilling. I did not say so. David says, in Psalms cx. 3: "*Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power!*" Who are God's people? how many souls belong to him? The answer is, *all!* Then *all* shall be willing to *believe* and be *saved* in the *day of God's power!* They are not going to be compelled. When they realize God's love, and appreciate his goodness, they will believe without compulsion. Christ said to the Saducees who denied the resurrection, "Ye do err not knowing the scriptures, nor the *power of God!*" It seems a great matter with Mr. Lozier, that God should *compel* or *force men into heaven,* and a small affair that he should FORCE THEM INTO HELL! Better, by far, that they should be forced into heaven, than into hell!

My argument upon the *will of God* remains unanswered. I gave you the testimony of Paul in 1st Tim. ii. 1, 6, where it is expressly declared that he "will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth." I quoted the language of the Savior, where he says, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the *will of him that hath sent me;* and this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should *lose nothing*, but should raise it up again at the last day." "My meat is to do the *will of him that hath sent me*, and to FINISH HIS WORK!" But the brother says, that the work will not be finished. I, for one, am willing to take Christ at his word, and believe he will *finish* the work of salvation.

Then, there is my argument on Rom. v. 18–21. How did he meet that? He did not meet it at all. Perhaps he wanted *two days more*, to answer it in, and perhaps if he had *two days* more, he would not answer it even then. That passage stands untouched, as an unanswerable testimony to the truth, that as wide, and as universal, as the dominion of sin has been, even so extensive shall be the abounding grace of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. I quoted the language of the great Methodist commentator, Dr. Clarke, who says, in reference to this passage, that "we find salvation here *as complete, and as extensive as the contamination of sin.* Death is conquered, the devil con-

founded, hell disappointed, and sin totally destroyed!" Sin is destroyed—sin, the cause of all the woes and ills that afflict our race, is *totally destroyed!* The cause being removed, the effect, which is misery and unhappiness, will, of course, cease. This argument, which we considered one of the strongest in support of the proposition, he passed over in silence. This, doubtless, was the best way to get rid of it.

My ninth argument was predicated upon the *kingdom and reign of Christ.* I gave you the testimony of Paul, where he says, "He must reign until he has put all enemies under his feet, and *death*, the *last enemy, shall be destroyed!*" That when this shall have been accomplished, he will deliver up the kingdom to God the Father, that "God may be all in all!" I quoted the language of Daniel, and the parallel testimonies in Isaiah and Jeremiah, to show that *Christ's kingdom* and *judgment* was set up at the *beginning of his reign*, and not at the *end!* That he was not to fail nor be discouraged, until he had "set up *judgment in the earth!*" I gave you, also, the Savior's own testimony, confirming that of the prophets, where he says, "For *judgment* I am come into the world!" "*Now is* the judgment of this world!" with numerous other testimonies, all going to show that Christ now rules and reigns on earth; and that he shall thus reign, until sin and death are totally destroyed, and the last human being restored to holi-

ness and happiness. But not one of the testimonies introduced in support of this argument, has Mr. Lozier noticed.

My argument upon the *resurrection* has shared the same fate, as his *two days'* rule has prevented him from answering it.

But I must close, as my time is up. I leave my arguments with you. Examine them, in the light of the testimonies presented, and may God lead you into all truth.

At the close of Mr. Foster's last speech, Mr. Lozier arose and said: I want the audience to note the fact that Mr. Foster has not attempted to make good his charge of plagiarism. He asserted, on the second evening of this debate, that he had nearly the whole of my argument, on the first night, in this book of Alexander Hall's, besides the doggerel verses about Noah and the antediluvians. I want him to point out the passage that I stole from Alexander Hall, and am willing he shall have time to do it. Here is the book, and here is my speech. I offered them to him before, and requested him to make good his charge. I want him to do it now.

MR. FOSTER replied: Allow me a word or two in explanation of what I said.

MR. LOZIER: I shall not give him time to make

any explanations. If he wants to point out the stolen passages in my speech, he can do it; but I shall not allow him to explain it all away. Let him take the book, and prove the truth of his statement.

MR. FOSTER: I am not represented correctly. I did not say Mr. Lozier had stolen his arguments from Alexander Hall. I said the verses were not original, as some might suppose, but were taken from a work of Alexander Hall, which contained also the substance of his argument. That is what I said.

FOURTH NIGHT.

PROPOSITION. Do the Scriptures and reason teach the doctrine of the endless punishment of any part of the human family?

MR. LOZIER'S FIRST SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

In entering upon the discussion of the question before us, I shall be bound by the same rules this week, which Mr. Foster laid down for the work of last week. I shall attempt to deduce the doctrine of the eternal punishment of some portion of the human race from the scriptures; and I shall hold him to his own rule, and not permit him to prove an alibi by other quotations, as he threatened he would do on Friday night last. He must follow his own rules, and prove that the arguments adduced are not logical, practical, and conclusive.

The doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, is taught in every possible form of language in the scriptures. In starting out, to prove the doctrine of the endless duration of punishment denounced in holy writ against the wicked, it will be well to fix the definition of "punish." Webster gives it in its primary meaning, as "to pain

to afflict with pain, loss or calamity for a crime or fault." The whole question stated is: "Do the scriptures and reason teach the doctrine that any part of the human race shall suffer endless pain, loss, or calamity, for any crime or fault?" As the basis of argument, I affirm that the scriptures are the revealed will and word of God, and they consist of laws and precepts given for man's direction; and consequently man's free agency follows as an inevitable sequence. Moral law can only affect a being capable of obeying or disobeying it. If man is not a free agent, God has been guilty of the folly of giving to a *machine* or a *brute*, laws to control them, which no sensible man would think of prescribing to a machine or a brute. He would not urge so plain a proposition. Further, all governments in their laws recognize man's free agency. When a man commits murder you do not so much inquire as to the weapon, as to the intent of the mind and heart. Did he *will* to do the murder. Upon any other hypothesis the Judge may as rationally hang the knife of the assassin, as the man. If Mr. Foster denies the doctrine of free agency, he denies the only rational basis upon which rests the law of God, or the statutes of civilized society. More, he denies the only rational basis upon which he preaches to his people, or controls his children. This much I adduce as to the *reasonableness* of the doctrine. I shall not attempt a large display of scripture on this point; for, as was once before re-

marked, the very first command in Genesis, and the last injunction in Revelations, respected this ability in man to choose for himself. One quotation, however, I will give—the entire paragraph embraced in Deuteronomy, xxx, commencing with the 15th verse, and embracing the balance of the chapter: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; In that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply; and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other Gods and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live. That thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him, (for he is thy life, and the length of thy days,) that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them." This cannot be misinterpreted or misunderstood. It proves that God gives man the

choice between good and evil, and their consequences. It proves that God *desires* that men choose the good, and live and enjoy happiness; but that this desire acts in *consonance* with man's free agency, appealing to his *will*, and urging him to make the choice which God pledges shall be best for him.

The doctrine of free agency being thus established by scripture and reason, and the fact being admitted that the Bible is God's word and law to man, I shall now proceed directly to my argument, which is substantially the same as laid down in a former branch of the subject—the *goodness*, *holiness*, *justice*, and *truth* of God.

Man being a free agent, God manifests his infinite benevolence, toward him, always with respect to his pardon. Wherefore, the divine goodness is not required to make all mankind actually happy, but to establish good laws, and so benevolently constitute the nature of things, as to give opportunity to men to secure to themselves the enjoyment of good. The divine goodness, though infinite and complete, can do no more for a free agent than this, without doing actual violence to the other perfections of the divine nature.

For example: God presents good and evil before Mr. Foster, and tells him if he does good, he will render the exact service that God of right demands of his creatures; but if he does evil, he will incur displeasure and punishment. In the face of these things, Mr. Foster deliberately does the for-

bidden thing. The heinousness of Mr. Foster's sin consists not in the amount of actual evil that may occur to other human beings, which seems to be his view, but the evil is in insulting the divinity of God. The results of the sin upon his fellow creatures is far from being the measure of his guilt. He tramples upon the holiness, justice, and truth of his nature. All the attributes of the divine nature are equal. "O house of Israel, are not my ways equal," saith the Lord—Ezekiel xviii. 29. God's love cannot exceed his holiness, or justice, or truth, for infinity cannot exceed infinity; and all God's attributes are infinite, or else God himself is not infinite.

I shall now proceed to show how, under the case, I have supposed, Mr. Foster tramples upon the three attributes named. He virtually says: "I know that God is a God of infinite holiness, and being infinitely holy, his aversion to this evil must be infinite: so that he cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance; nevertheless, I will *do* this evil right in the face of his holiness, trusting that his infinite goodness will save me from the penalty that his infinite truth has denounced."

In all reverence, I will inquire, what could God do? If his infinite goodness should interpose and rescue man from the consequences of offense against his infinite holiness, God would, by that very act, impeach his own nature, and proclaim to

the universe that he was *not* "perfect" in *all* his ways, but that his holiness is imperfect and disregarded by himself. No intelligent mind will assume such an absurdity.

I shall now take up the attribute of justice. If God is opposed to sin, he must restrict it. I have already shown that with a free agent, this could be done by acquainting man with the knowledge of evil and its consequences, and leaving him to his own volition. No matter how law may be written, justice demands that the violation of it be punished in proportion to the aggravated nature of the offense. But Mr. Foster does the crime, relying on the goodness of God to save him from the penalties which infinite justice demands. Justice is as infinite in its strength, and its demands, as goodness; and if a conflict between them were possible, neither could overcome the other without destroying the very throne of God himself. Whoever, then, sins under the radiance of his goodness for salvation, insults God by the implication that his virtue is imperfect.

But it insults God's *truth*. God *tells* him the consequences of sin, but Mr. Foster commits the evil relying on God's goodness. Again is this hope frustrated by the same reason as before, except there is a conflict between the divine attributes. No one would presume to say that God can war against himself. Thus it is shown, that the heinousness of man's crime consists chiefly in

the insults and indignity that any act of sin offers to the Almighty, in that the commission of the act in the face of the commands and threatenings of God, even though it be done under the blasphemious pretence of reliance on his holiness, implies that God is a liar—that he is neither infinite in holiness, justice, or truth, while claiming to be infinite in *all* his attributes. Hence the force of the apostle's declaration: "Sin is the *transgression* of the law."

This view of sin must, of necessity, dispel the unscriptural delusion of "little sins." An insult offered to the infinite goodness, holiness, justice, and truth of God, derives infinite proportions from the infinity of the being who is insulted, and must receive infinite punishment, unless pardoned through Jesus Christ; for, throughout all eternity, it could never appeal to the attributes it has insulted, without finding that they remain immutable, each insulted attribute exclaiming in succession, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still."—Rev. xxii. 11.

I shall now proceed to consider a matter, upon the very threshold of which, we should stop and gaze with speechless adoration. I refer to the scheme of man's redemption, thanking God that such a God as the God of the Bible had the case of man's guilt in his hands. We cannot express,

for inspiration fails to express, the emotion that moved the divine mind, when man of his own volition fell. If goodness had then stepped forth alone, and asserted its supremacy, and brought man involuntarily back to his first innocency, the free agency of his nature would have been destroyed, and man would have been man no more. It would have destroyed the respect, not only of that man, but of all men, and angels, too, for God's holiness, justice and truth; for when God would himself disregard these attributes, he would invite all intelligences to follow his example.

And what if justice had stepped forth alone to meet man? One blow of his keen sword would have severed the last thread of hope, and set the race adrift upon the boundless, lineless, rayless ocean of eternal despair! So, also, had any other attribute whereby man could have been affected, been left to deal alone with man. But God was not hasty. He waited until "the cool of the day," and when he came, he came bearing the glorious tidings that the insulted attributes of Deity had resolved upon a mutual sacrifice, and had combined to evolve a being who should be divine in essence, and human in form, and in whom divinity and humanity should be so united, that by *suffering* for man, *dying* for man, *rising* for man, and *interceding* for man, he might open up "a new and *living* way," through his own blood, whereby man might return to divine favor and eternal happiness. In

Heb. x. 19, 20, we read: "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh."

It was in view of this being, that David sang: "Mercy and truth have met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Paul also refers to it in Romans iii. 19–26, inclusive: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped; and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righeousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Jesus himself, said, in John iii. 16: "For God so loved

the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." And I now lay down the proposition, that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ will prevent the eternal punishment of any human being, to whom the same is intelligibly presented. The terms of salvation, all through the gospel, are "faith in Christ."

But the commission which Christ gave to his apostles, teaches the same. Mark xvi. 15, 16: "And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that *believeth*, and is baptized, shall be *saved;* but he that *believeth not* shall be *damned.*" This teaches not only the doctrine that the Savior himself held, but what he would have his ministers preach to the world. I am satisfied to rest the evening's discussion with these words of the Savior; and only ask that Mr. Foster shall bind himself by his own rule, and not attempt an *alibi* with other scripture; and also, as he has said so much about "two days," I shall expect an immediate answer to my arguments.

MR. FOSTER'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

RESPECTED FRIENDS:

As remarked, in our introductory on the first proposition, the question of man's final destiny is one of the most important and interesting, that can possibly engage the attention of the human mind. And doubly important does that question become, when it involves the possibility of the endless woe and ruin of myriads of created intelligences! And in entering upon the discussion of our second proposition, I cannot but pity my brother from the bottom of my heart, that he has engaged to defend a doctrine fraught with results so derogatory to the character of that God, who is declared to be "good unto all," and whose "tender mercies are over all his works!" Yes, I cannot but commisserate his condition, in the sad and gloomy work he has undertaken! Did the sentiment find any response in his heart, or did it accord with the holy and generous impulses of his nature, there might be some reasons presented in extenuation of his labor. But no! while the sentiment may receive the sanction of the head, and the approbation of a cold and speculative theology, it benumbs and chills the very fountains of sympathy and compassion in the soul! Endless punishment inflicted by a God of love, on a part of his own offspring, for the sins and delinquencies of a finite existence! Why, if such doctrine be true, it should

be indellibly impressed upon every page of the Bible, in characters not to be misunderstood. Think for a moment, of the consequences of the doctrine! There is not one in this large congregation, that is not directly and personally interested in the solution of the problem now before us! For, if true, it invades the sanctuary of the home circle, and sunders the holiest chords that ever vibrated in the human heart? Fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, parents and children, are you prepared to accept as true, a doctrine that makes shipwreck of every holy desire and fond aspiration of the soul? That proclaims an endless separation from those you love most dear? And yet this is the result of the doctrine my brother has undertaken to defend upon the present occasion. No marvel is it, that he treads lightly upon the threshold of its investigation. No wonder that he should try to avoid a direct issue upon the real merits of the doctrine, and seek to clothe it in a more comely apparel! But even this cannot hide its deformities—its doom is pronounced, and it must give way to those eternal and immutable truths, which will endure, when sun, moon, and stars shall have all vanished away!

As my opponent has the affirmative of this proposition, I shall expect him to present those testimonies, if any such are to be found, which record the doctrine in the most positive and unmistakable language—which have a direct bearing upon the

duration of punishment! not one of which, has he presented to-night.

The question is not, will God punish mankind for the transgression of his laws? This sentiment is plainly taught in the scriptures; and the experience of six thousand years in the world's history, has abundantly confirmed the fact. The question to be determined is, what amount, what extent of punishment will God's love sanction? Will it render the sinner a hopeless, miserable, ruined outcast *forever and ever?* Will it banish him eternally from the presence of God, and the companionship of angels? Will it place him beyond the reach of love? where its holy ministries can never reclaim him? Can God as a being of love, seal the fate of millions of his own offspring in endless woe and wretchedness? These are questions of great moment to every child of humanity, and that must be met in the light of the proposition before us. Nor will it do to present testimonies of merely an *implied* character, or doubtful import as to their true meaning—testimonies which admit of great latitude in their interpretation. Where immortal interests are at stake, we have a right to demand that the testimony shall be of the most *positive* and unequivocal character. Nor will it avail Mr. Lozier anything, even though he could prove a punishment beyond death, unless he can prove that punishment to be of *infinite duration.*

The consequences involved in the doctrine of

endless punishment, are so horrible and monstrous, that it will avail my opponent but little, to array a multiplicity of scriptural passages, unless he can show that *each one presented*, teaches clearly the sentiment of the proposition. Fine spun arguments and metaphysical disquisitions, will not suffice upon a subject thus weighty and momentous in its character. We want the most incontrovertible evidence, the most positive assurance, that God's love in the coming ages of the future, is to be withdrawn from the sinner, and that he is to be consigned to that region of torment, where age will roll on after age, only to perpetuate his round of misery and despair!

I am willing to admit to a certain extent, the *moral agency* of man; but I am not prepared to accept the conclusion, that his *final destiny* is made in the least contingent upon that *agency*. So far as his career upon the stage of time is concerned, his agency controls directly his happiness or misery. As a finite being, his acts involve finite results alone—nor can he perform an act that will involve infinite results! And it is mere assumption, to contend that the final destiny of man is made contingent upon the deeds of this life. This is the very point to be proven. The Bible does not warrant such a sentiment, nor does it receive the sanction of reason. And to assert that finite beings can, by the deeds of a few years of transitory existence, peril their immortal interests, is to assert

a sentiment wholly at variance with the plainest teachings of reason and revelation. Again, the position that a finite creature can, by his *evil deeds*, involve himself in, or merit an *infinite curse*, is in effect an admission that he can merit *infinite happiness* as the reward of his *good deeds!* And as we are to be rewarded "*according to our deeds*, whether *good* or *bad*," the destiny of an individual is involved in infinite consequences, which are in direct conflict with each other! It likewise predicates man's final salvation upon *works*, and not upon *grace!* A plain contradiction of the testimony of the apostle, in Eph. ii. 8, "By *grace are ye saved* through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the *gift of God!*"

True, the Bible addresses man as a moral agent. In the administration of his government, God has enacted certain laws for the benefit of his children. Obedience to those laws is productive of happiness, while disobedience results in misery and wretchedness. But in neither case, is the reward endless happiness or eternal misery! Man's acts involve finite consequences alone! His present happiness, peace, and enjoyment are suspended upon his agency, as controlled by surrounding circumstances. If he would be happy, he must be virtuous; while an opposite course of conduct will invariably produce opposite results! Further than this, his agency cannot go. The issues of death have not been committed to his hands. He has

no power to peril those interests that are to run parallel with eternity. Says the Psalmist, "He that, is our God, is the God of salvation, and *unto God the Lord*, belongeth the *issues from death!*" "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the *spirit to the God who gave it!*"

Mr. Lozier has quoted Deuteronomy xxx. 15–20, where life and death are spoken of in contrast: "See I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; In that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shall be drawn away, and worship other Gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall utterly perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan, to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life that both thou and thy seed may live: That thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him, (for he is thy life, and the length of thy days,) that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them."

Why did he not turn back to the xxviii. chapter, of the same book, where the doctrine of rewards and punishments under the old dispensation is more fully set forth. Where the same blessings and curses for obedience and disobedience are more clearly specified. Verses 1–6: "And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and do all his commandments which I command thee this day: that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all the nations of the earth: And all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God. *Blessed* shalt thou be *in the city!* and *blessed* shalt thou be *in the field!* Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattle, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Blessed shalt be thy basket and thy store. Blessed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and blessed shalt thou be when thou goest out." So much for the *blessings*. Now for the *curses*. Verses 15–19: "But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to all his commandments, and his statutes, which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee: *Cursed* shalt *thou be in the city!* and *cursed* shalt thou be *in the field!* Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the in-

crease of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out!" The *blessing* and *cursing* in regard to obedience and disobedience are both placed *in the earth!* There are no *eternal curses* threatened in the whole chapter. So in chapter xxx., the life and death, are the same as that spoken of in Genesis, where it is said "In the *day* thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely *die!*" This was neither *a physical* or *eternal death*, but a *moral* or *spiritual death*—as our first parents lived a long time subsequent to the day of transgression. It was the same death recorded in Deuteronomy, the opposite of which is *moral* or *spiritual life.* Said Jesus in John v. 24, "He that heareth my word, and *believeth on him* that hath sent me, *hath everlasting life*, and shall not come unto condemnation; but *is passed from death unto life!*" Here we have the *death* and *life*, both spoken of as confined to the present state. Again, says Paul in Eph. ii. 1: "And you hath he quickened, (or made alive,) who *were dead* in tresspasses and in sins!" In Romans vi. 23, we read: "For the wages of sin *is death!* but the *gift* of God is *eternal life!*" Many other testimonies might be quoted, but let these suffice.

In fact, the Old Testament no where teaches the doctrine of endless punishment. This fact is conceded by the most eminent commentators of which we have any knowledge. Among them are

Whitby, Warburton, Payley, Campbell, Macknight, Pearce, and a host of others, whose names it is not necessary that I should mention. Bishop Warburton says: "In the Jewish republic, both rewards and punishments promised by heaven, were *temporal.* * * * In *no place in the Mosaic Institutes*, is there the least intelligible hint of the *rewards and punishments of another life!*"

Universal experience fully corroborates the testimony of revelation in regard to rewards and punishments—that "there is a God who *judgeth in the earth!*" That "the righteous *are recompensed in the earth*, much more the wicked and the sinner!" My friends, bring the matter home to your own hearts, and ask yourselves the question, whether you have not been fully rewarded for all the good you have done in the world? You never did a good act in your lives, that you did not feel that you were made better by the deed of love. And so, on the other hand, you were never guilty of a mean act or crime, that you were not lowered in your own estimation, as well as that of your fellow man. While the man of honesty and virtue, reaps an abundant reward in well doing, the vicious and sinful person finds, fully verified in his case, the truth of heaven, that "the way of the transgressor is hard"—that "there is no peace to the wicked!" Go where he will, he finds no resting place, where he can shield himself from the goadings of a guilty conscience. The eye of omniscience is ever upon

him, and his curse constantly following him, "A fugitive and a vagabond *shalt thou be in the earth!*"

Mr. Lozier has quoted Rom. iii. 19–26: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justfied in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Why did he not go a little farther, and give us the fifth chapter, where the apostle makes the argument more full and complete, in regard to the *sinfulness of man*, and the *extent of God's grace!* Where he shows, that *as extensive* as are the effects of *sin and death*, even *so extensive* will be the reign of

grace and *righteousness!* Turn, also, to Rom. xi. 25, where the apostle sums up the whole matter: "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits) that blindness in part has happened unto Israel, until the *fulness of the Gentiles* be come in. And so *all Israel shall be saved!*" Verse 32: "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have *mercy upon all!*" Verse 36: "For of him, and through him, and *to him are all things!* to whom be glory, forever. Amen." Here is the grand consummation! God concluded all in unbelief, not that he might *damn them all*, but that he might have *mercy upon all!* Well does the apostle exclaim: "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out."

Mr. Lozier then introduced Mark xvi. 15, 16: "And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." As Mr. Lozier simply quoted the passage, without attempting any argument upon it, we shall give it only a passing notice, at this time, reminding him that the phrase "he that believeth not," includes the whole heathen world, as well as all infants and idiots! And thus, as with a besom of destruction, are consigned to endless torments these several

classes of mankind, who have never heard the gospel, and are not capable of exercising faith in its life giving precepts. If life is a state of probation—if the change necessary to our future salvation, can only be effected here; if a belief in the gospel, and an obedience to its requirements, are the requisites of salvation beyond the grave, then is there no hope for the entire *heathen world!* They die sinners, and as there is no change after death, according to Mr. Lozier's theory, they must remain sinners eternally. God has no special laws for any part of his intelligent creation. The principles of his government are world wide in their application, and universal in their extent and dominion. The command is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, mind, might and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself!" On every being this law is binding, and in order to *final salvation*, it must be fulfilled! It is equally applicable to the heathen, as well as the christian. So that the whole heathen world, as well as all infants and idiots, who are not recognized as subjects of faith, are to be eternally lost. It will not do to say that God has provided some other way for the salvation of these classes. There is but one way of salvation. Christ says, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me!" If you and I, are to be saved in this way, so must the whole heathen world, as well as all other beings created in the image of God! Let Mr. Lozier

notice these objections, and remove them if he can. Let him show how the heathen world are to be saved, and I will show you how all mankind will be saved upon the same ground.

I shall now proceed to introduce a negative argument against the proposition, founded on the *justice of God.* We shall show that the divine justice is opposed to the endless punishment of a single soul whom God has created. That God is just, the following testimonies fully prove: Deut. xxxii. 4: "A God of truth and without iniquity, *just* and *right* is he." Isaiah xiv. 21: "A *just God*, and a *Savior!*" Rev. xv. 3: "*Just* and *true* are thy ways, thou king of saints." Job iv. 17: "Shall mortal man be more *just* than God?" Psalms lxxxix. 14: "*Justice* and judgment are the habitation of thy throne."

God's justice is infinitely perfect; and hence all its demands must be accomplished. The simple idea of justice, is *right.* It claims that whatever is wrong in the moral world, shall be righted; that all opposing influences to man's happiness shall be destroyed. Mr. Lozier will, no doubt, advance the old theory, that justice demands the endless punishment of the sinner; but such an idea is purely vindictive, and strips punishment of its design to reform. The work of justice is to correct evil, to see that every violation of the principle of right is rectified. God's punishments are all inflicted with reference to the demands of justice—

and no more punishment will be meted out to an individual, that what may be necessary to secure the end of justice, which is the good of the sinner. The law of God is founded upon the principle of justice; and there is no penalty annexed to it, that will contravene its benevolent design, which is the happiness of all intelligent creatures! In Psalms xix. 7, we read: "The *law* of the Lord is *perfect, converting the soul!*" Hence all the operations of this law, must be characterized by its own perfection!

Man being the emanation of a higher power, the effect of a producing cause, *justice* demands that he shall not be made the loser by his existence. Nor will it avail my brother anything, to say that God did not *compel* him to sin and suffer—that it was a matter of his own choice. Talk as we may, the circumstances of his being, are controlled by a superior power. God could have given him an agency doubtless, that would have periled his immortal interests; or he could have rendered his final happiness secure! Justice would forever forbid the act of creation, on the hypothesis that his final destiny is imperilled. A solemn and eternal protest in the name of justice, is entered against such an act of cruelty. Justice throws its protecting arms around the sinner and shields him from all unnecessary punishment. Creating man as he did, of his own free will and accord—making him just such a being as his wisdom and goodness dictated,

justice demands that he shall not be placed in a situation which the Creator foresees will result in his irremedial wretchedness! Justice forbids such a result as attending the government of God. Nor is there any conflict between the justice of God, and his love and mercy. The one requires no more than is sanctioned by the other. There is a perfect harmony between the attributes of *justice and mercy!* Says David, in Psalms lxii. 12, "Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth *mercy!* for thou renderest to every man *according to his works!*" The work of mercy may be seen even in God's judgments and punishments. They both aim at the reformation of the offender, and would bring him to holiness and happiness. It is no evidence that God does not love the sinner, because he punishes him. On the contrary, it is a positive proof of God's love. He can *punish* in accordance with the demands of *justice*, and yet *forgive* him. Says the prophet, Isaiah xi. 1, 2: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that *her iniquity is pardoned:* for she *hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins!*" Here pardon and punishment are spoken of as being in perfect harmony with each other. Again, in Psalms xcix. 8, we read, "Thou wast a God that *forgavest them*, though thou *tookest vengeance of their inventions!*"

I call upon Mr. Lozier to meet this argument

upon the justice of God; for I regard it as an invincible proof against the doctrine of endless torment!

My *second* negative argument against the proposition, is, that the doctrine of endless punishment destroys all *certainty* in the administration of rewards and punishments. No truth is more plainly taught in the Bible, than that God will reward every man *according to his works!* In Rom. ii. 6, we read "Who will render to *every man, according to his deeds!*" Here the language is emphatic, and admits of no limitation or false interpretation. It proclaims the doctrine of *certainty*, in regard to rewards and punishments. And it is the *certainty*, as I have intimated before, and not the *severity* of punishment, that gives it efficacy and power to reform. Again, we read in Col. iii. 25: "But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong that he hath done; and there is *no respect of persons!*" The same sentiment is taught in 2d Cor. v. 10, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, *according to that he hath done*, whether it be *good or bad!*" In Prov. xi. 21, we find a testimony equally strong, "Though hand join in hand the *wicked shall not be unpunished!*" From these testimonies it will be seen, that there is a proportion between the crime and the penalty. That we are to be rewarded *according to our works!* which is not the case upon the hypothesis that my brother's doctrine is true. Here is an individual

in your community, for instance, whom you have all known as an honest, upright, and pious man. He has been noted for his deeds of goodness and love. He has alleviated the many woes of suffering humanity, whenever the opportunity offered. He has obeyed as near as it is possible for a finite creature to do, all the requirements of God's law. Thus he lives for half a century. He may perform during that period nought but good deeds and benevolent acts; and yet one step aside from the path of duty, just before life's close, is all that is necessary to consign him to *endless punishment!* If this be true, where, I ask, does he get his *reward* for his *good deeds?* The deeds of love, of half a century? For mark you, he is to receive "according to that he hath done, whether *good* or *bad!*" So that you see he gets no reward at all! And thus the *certainty* of a reward for well doing is destroyed.

Another individual pursues an opposite course of life. He is dishonest, vile, and profligate. He is guilty of almost every crime upon the catalogue of transgression. He lives a long life of sin and iniquity; but near its close he repents, and embraces Mr. Lozier's doctrine. In other words, he is converted, in the popular acceptation of the term, and becomes religious. He dies, and goes to heaven, there to enjoy an eternity of bliss! But where, I ask, does he get his punishment for the *evil deeds* of his former life? For the *crimes of half a century!* He gets no punishment at all!

So that it is not true, in his case, that he is rewarded in the future world *according to his works!* The case may be presented, even in a stronger light. A man may live in iniquity all his days—may murder his hundreds of victims, and yet between the time of his sentence, and the execution, he may repent and escape all the punishment which his crimes so justly deserve.

But again—if the *character at death* fixes the destiny of each and every individual, there can be no such thing as a reward *according to works*, in the future world!

So far as hell is concerned, I will simply say, that I believe in all the hell of which the Bible speaks, but am not prepared to accept the view of it given by Mr. Lozier. David was in hell, and yet was delivered from it. No where do we read of an *endless hell*, or of a hell beyond this life! We believe, also, in punishment; that sin will be surely punished; that there is no possible avenue of escape for the sinner; that if he transgresses God's law, he will suffer the penalty, and that, in the very day of transgression. That "God will by *no means* clear the guilty!" That the "way of the transgressor *is hard!*" That the "wicked *are* like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt." The "wages of sin *is death!*" Thus the Bible speaks in regard to sin and its penalty, and we believe every word it says. Christ came to save men from *sin*—not from *pun-*

ishment! And when the certainty of punishment is fully believed and taught, then, and not till then, may we hope to see the tide of iniquity rolled back, and man saved from its power and influence.

FIFTH NIGHT.

MR. LOZIER'S SECOND SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

Whatever might have been the surprise of the audience, or the mortification of Mr. Foster's friends, it was no matter of astonishment to me, that Mr. Foster pursued the course that he did, on last evening. Doubtless some *did* expect that Mr. Foster, having laid down the rule that "he should expect *his* opponent to prove that his arguments, deduced *from the text given*, are not sound, practical, and conclusive," he would certainly follow his *own* rule, for *shame*, if not for consistency's sake. But he was consistent to his own character, as well as with the threat of last Friday evening, that he would "attempt an *alibi*," and dodge the argument. He was wily and wise, but not quite so wise as Solomon, who said: "He that diggeth a pit shall fall therein, and he that rolleth a stone,

it shall return upon him." He is in the "pit," with the "stone" on the top of him, and there the verdict of intelligent hearers and readers will leave him. But what did he do with the argument? He wanted no "two days" to answer that. He opened his old book of thumbed and dingy manuscript, containing arguments upon which he has been whipped at Knightstown, and Shelbyville, and Vevay, and probably a dozen other places in Indiana, during the last twenty years, and he launches *them* forth. We must be charitable for *accidents*, however; for it is quite evident, from the striking similarity between this argument and his first argument last week, that he either opened *his book in the wrong place*, or else, like "the blind horse in a bark mill," he is grinding away upon the *old* question, unconscious of the lapse of time and the change of circumstances. Perhaps he is not *satisfied* with the result of last week's effort, and thinks that by skillful angling he may yet be able to fish up his friend Judas from the "perdition" in which he unfortunately let him drop.

After reading from those old manuscripts, Mr. Foster did deign to allude to the argument on moral agency, and said that he was willing to admit it, to a "certain extent." There was hope for Mr. Foster, if he would only stand still long enough, in any one place, to be counted on either side of the question. Last week, according to Mr. Foster, God *compelled* every act of man; this week,

man is free to a "certain extent." But further along, in the argument, Mr. Foster trips into his fatalism again, in saying: "It is vain to say that man need not fall—that God has given him power to stand, if he will but use the means."

Man is a moral agent, to a certain extent, yet God foresaw, and consequently foreordained *all* his acts and their consequences! Where does Mr. Foster's certain extent come in, if *all* mens' acts and *all* their results are foreordained? But Mr. Foster said that he was not at all prepared to say that man's final destiny is made, in the least, dependent upon his agency. He whose doctrine Mr. Foster claimed to be preaching, accepted such a conclusion, for he predicated everlasting life upon man's belief, and death on his disbelief. John iii. 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." In this passage, "eternal life," and "abideth in death," are in antithesis, and the same doctrine appertains to one as to the other. This was the doctrine Christ taught, and what he told his disciples to teach, and Mr. Foster, who claims to be a preacher of the gospel, *par excellence*, should preach that "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." If he preached that doctrine to his people, they would say he had either gone crazy or been converted. His doctrine is, that he that "believeth

not" shall be saved anyhow. In reply to Mr. Foster's statement, that those who "believeth not" included heathens, insane, and idiots, for they could not believe in Christ, and hence must be damned, I am not entirely sure, but under the last item, God would save anybody who could give such an interpretation to the passage, especially in the face of Rom. x. 14: "How shall they believe in whom they have not heard," and again, in chapter xvii., "Faith comes by hearing."

In reply to what Mr. Foster said on Deuteronomy, xxx. 15–20, I said he was talking of man's moral agency, and not as Mr. Foster would make him, of the question of punishment. He dodged the argument, and wanted to know why the 28th chapter was not quoted. One reason was, that all I wanted to prove was conclusively shown in the 20th. In this way were all the arguments met. I am glad that the "respected auditors" have more intelligence than Mr. Foster's sophisms implies. But to the direct argument. Mr. Foster says the Old Testament neither teaches nor hints at the doctrine of future punishment, and quoted Pearce, Macknight, and other commentators. Here he made one of his strong points, and doubtless some in the audience thought he had a weighty argument in the "silence" of the Old Testament scriptures. Pearce and Macknight *admit* this silence, the same as Mr. Foster makes Adam Clarke admit Universalism, by garbling words and distorting their meaning.

All standard commentators and Biblologists, agree that, not until one hundred and twenty-nine years after Nehemiah wrote his prophecy, which, chronologically speaking, was the last book of the Old Testament—not until then, and more than a century after the Old Testament was written, did any person arise in the church of God, who for one moment pretended to call in question the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. The whole Jewish nation believed it, and certainly Mr. Foster cannot be ignorant of that fact. Then it was that Zadoc or Sadoc, originated the doctrine that there is no reward or punishment, or even existence in a future State. This Sadoc was the founder of the sect that bore his name, the Sadducees, who were the first people in the world claiming to be worshippers of God, who taught the doctrine that Mr. Foster teaches concerning punishment. Hence it is that the Old Testament writers do not dwell much upon this question. What everybody believed, needed but little argument. But I contend that the old scriptures do teach the doctrine of eternal punishment, and would refer you to Isaiah, where that prophet presents a vision of the glory of the new Jerusalem, in the last five verses of his prophecy. This is the last verse: "And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me, for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an

abhorring to all flesh." Mr. Foster will give his interpretation of the expression, "where the worm dieth not." Hear how Christ interprets it in Mark ix. 43–48: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Isaiah's teaching does not stand alone. In the last chapter of Daniel, and first three verses, the prophet gives his vision of the resurrection, and the subsequent *everlasting punishment* of the wicked. What doctrine is this Daniel is teaching? He is talking about the coming forth of those "that sleep in the dust of the earth"—that is, the resurrection. Now, says Daniel, they "shall come forth, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt." But Mr. Foster says the Old Testament don't teach any such doctrine as endless punishment. The "shame and contempt," and "everlasting life" are all the same thing; for if all do not

enjoy everlasting life, then whoever endures "everlasting shame and contemp" is *punished*, for the loss of everlasting life, and the enduring of everlasting shame and contempt is punishment.

I want the audience to notice how Mr. Foster will answer this; for he must take hold of it, and do something with it. There are other Old Testament scriptures, as for instance, its last book—Malachi—is full of it; but sufficient has been quoted.

To turn to the New Testament. When Jesus came into the world, the Sadducees had grown to be a very influential sect, and if their "no punishment" doctrine was correct, Christ would not have hesitated to confirm it. But Jesus warned his disciples to beware of the doctrines of the Sadducees. Matthew xvi. 12. But to the testimony of Christ. In Matthew x. 28, after Christ had given instructions to his apostles, and was sending them out into the world, he warned them of the perils and persecutions that were before them—"but," said he, "fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Now, what does Jesus teach here? First, that the body may be killed and the soul live on; second, that the body and soul may both be destroyed in hell; and thirdly, it teaches that hell is a *place* in which souls and bodies may be destroyed. As Mr. Foster has repeatedly said he believed in hell, and in a good deal of hell, I would like to know what

kind of hell it is. I believe in the kind referred to above.

But in Matt. xiii., in which are eight distinct parables, there is a full treatise upon the whole question. I will read the first of these parables; that of the sower. Verses 24–29: "Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in the field? from whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let them both grow together until the harvest; and in the time of the harvest, I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat unto my barn."

When Jesus uttered this parable, there seemed to be a kind of mystery hanging about it, that the disciples could not understand. It seemed to ring in their ears. So after Jesus had sent the multitudes away, they came to him privately and said, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the

field." Now mark, the language that follows is not the parable; but it is Christ's *commentary* upon his own parable. Said he: "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the *end of the world*, and the reapers are the angels." That is Christ's commentary, and it is clear as to who the people are. Now what is to be done with them? "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. *Then* shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

This is Christ's commentary; we shall hear Mr. Foster's after a while. But he must be careful that he does not give Christ the lie, or he may strike him dumb, and thus silence his blasphemy.

We shall now take up Christ's doctrine upon the judgment and its results, recorded in Matt. xxv. 31–46: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall sep-

arate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did

not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." The time that Christ alludes to here, is when he shall come in his glory. He was here in his humiliation then; but he will come in his glory, accompanied by his "holy angels," and seated upon his throne, just as John saw him, in Revelation. "And before him shall be gathered all nations." Mr. Foster will probably tell you this is something about the Jews, and Jesusalem, etc. "*All* nations" are to be there. Next, a separation is to be made of these people, "as a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats," and the sheep are to be placed on the right hand, and the goats on the left. Then each receives the sentence—first, the sheep. These shall inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world. Then the goats—his enemies, who did not minister to, or sympathize with him—are sentenced: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "*These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.*" Here we have the delaration of Jesus Christ, that after the day of judgment, some portion of the human family shall go away into everlasting punishment.

Mr. Foster should be dumb, before these words of

Jesus; but he will not. He will ring the changes upon the word "everlasting," and tell us that it does not mean what we understand by the word; that it is used in "everlasting hills;" and that God promised Canaan to the Jews for an "everlasting inheritance," when, in fact, they lost it long ages ago; and he will say, if *that everlasting* had an end, the other one may have one also. The rule for the use of the words "everlasting," and "eternal," is that they always signify the longest time *possible* to the subject to which they apply. For instance, "everlasting hills" means the longest time possible to the hills; and when we say "eternal home of the soul," we mean the longest time possible for the soul. This is one of the plainest and most obvious rules in philology, and will not be controverted. If the word everlasting is applied to the destiny of resurrected and immortal beings, then it means the longest possible time for immortal beings, and Mr. Foster is estopped from evasion. But the phrases "eternal life," and "everlasting punishment," are in antithesis, and the punishment is of as long duration to the wicked, as life is to the righteous. This was Christ's last discourse, as recorded by Matthew, and knowing the doctrines of the Sadducees, by whom he was surrounded, he was determined not to be misunderstood, except by those who wilfully and wickedly "wrest the scriptures unto their own destruction." I will conclude the argument on

this point, by asking Mr. Foster the question, if he had wanted to state the doctrine of final punishment, and had been in Christ's stead, what stronger and clearer language could he have used?"

We shall now notice the case of Judas Iscariot, the particulars of which are in Matthew xxvi. 21–25. "And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceedingly sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him; but wo unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born."

Mr. Foster has repeatedly said God could not have created any being without intending his eternal happiness, and that no matter how long the punishment—if it be a million ages—it must end at last. If this is correct, God must have foreseen that the eternal happiness of Judas in the end must infinitely outweigh any amount of punishment, and why did he then say it were good for him if he had not been born? If he had not been born, he would have been a nonenity, and is nonexistence preferable to an eternity of happiness? Mr. Foster's hell does not amount to much. It is only a place where sin will be kept away from

man, so that God's love can act more efficaciously upon him, and "run and be glorified." But why did Christ say of Judas, it were better if he had never been born? Because he was *lost.* Not "as an apostle," as Mr. Foster so *profoundly* remarked the other night, but lost to heaven—a son of perdition, a child of the devil, and doomed to endure with him eternal punishment. And as Mr. Foster has challenged me to this debate, and asked me to prove that *any part* of the human race shall suffer endless punishment, I give him this case *specifically*, in addition to all those embraced in preceding texts.

I will now predicate another argument on the sin against the Holy Ghost. Mark iii. 28, 29: "Verily I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." I have only time to introduce this testimony. Mr Foster says nobody is in danger of eternal damnation. Christ says to the contrary. Which tells the truth, Christ or Foster?

I will also introduce 2 Thess. i. 6–10: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the

gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." I shall offer no comment on these words. Turn also to Rev. xiv. 9–11: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever."

I will sum up the argument and testimonies of to-night, as follows:

1. "The worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched."—Is. lxvi. 24.

2. "Shame and everlasting contempt."—Dan. xii. 28.

3. "Destroy both soul and body in hell."—Matt. x. 28.

4. "The tares."—Matt. xiii.

5. "The sheep and the goats."—Matt. xxv.

6. "Judas Iscariot."—Matt. xxvi. 21–25.

7. "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost."—Mark iii. 28.

8. "*End* is destruction."—Phil. iii. 18.

9. "Everlasting destruction from the presence of God."—2 Thess. i. 6–10.

10. "Smoke of torment forever and ever."—Rev. xiv. 9, 10.

MR. FOSTER'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

RESPECTED HEARERS:

I had hoped that my opponent ere this would have learned something of the rules of christian courtesy. His assertion that my doctrines are blasphemous and infidel, but illy become one who professes to be a minister of the gospel. We meet in this discussion upon equal terms; and I have been willing to accord to Mr. Lozier all honesty of sentiment, and had trusted that the same honesty of purpose would have been accorded me in the proclamation of my doctrines. The words and manner of Mr. Lozier on the last evening, are in striking contrast with those of to-night.

Before proceeding to reply to the arguments of to-night, I wish to notice once more the passage introduced in his speech of Monday evening, in Mark xvi. 16: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mr. Lozier is unsparing in his charges of my perverting Scripture, and quoting detached passages; and yet upon this passage, the only one introduced that has the least bearing upon the proposition under discussion, he left off his quotation in the middle of the paragraph. Why did he not read verses 17 and 18: "And *these signs shall follow them that believe.* In my name they shall *cast out devils;* they shall *speak with new tongues;* they shall *take up serpents;* and if they *drink any*

deadly thing, it shall *not hurt them;* they shall *lay hands on the sick*, and *they shall recover!*" I would ask Mr. Lozier, if the test of belief here presented *follows the believer now?* If not, why does he quote the passage in support of the proposition? Can he cast out devils, speak with a new tongue, take up serpents, drink deadly poisons, or lay hands on the sick, so that they shall recover? If not, then he is no believer, for these signs were to follow the believer. Mr. Lozier's view of this passage is destructive of Christianity itself, by holding out the infidel argument against the Bible. The infidel will point to the believer, and ask for the signs; and from the fact that they do not follow him *now*, he regards it as a mere fable. And thus in his zeal to perpetuate a cherished sentiment or dogma, does Mr. Lozier sap the very foundations upon which Christianity rests. There is not a word in the text, or its whole connection, in support of the proposition, or which involves the endless punishment of the unbeliever.

In not one instance on last evening did he quote a passage bearing upon the question under consideration. He gave us a finely written essay upon free agency, which had evidently been prepared with great care; but what it had to do with proving the *endless punishment* of any part of God's children, we could not comprehend. Were we to admit his premises correct in regard to free agency, and God's justice, there might be some

plausibility in his argument. But here is where he fails. He assumes that man is a free agent, and that God's justice is such as here attends judicial tribunals. When the fact is, God's ways are not as our ways, his thoughts are not as our thoughts, his judgments are not as our judgments. While human laws, owing to the imperfection of the beings that enact them, are imperfect, and hence fail of securing the ends of justice, God's laws are perfect, being framed in infinite wisdom and dictated by infinite love, and therefore cannot fail of securing the desired end—the good of all the subjects of his government.

Upon the theory of Mr. Lozier, there is an eternal conflict between the attributes of God, mercy and justice. The one would *save*, while the other would *damn the sinner!* But such is not the case. *Justice*, as well as *mercy*, demands the *final good* of the sinner! If endless torment be true, the demands of justice can never be satisfied!

I trust the audience will bear in mind the proposition before us for discussion; and I hope you will have sufficient discrimination to judge as to the relative bearing the testimonies adduced by my opponent, have upon it. He has given us numerous quotations of scripture, containing threatenings and denunciations; but the very point to be proven, he has assumed, that they embody the idea of *endless punishment!* Let him show from their phraseology or context, that they teach the endless

torment of the wicked! He will then have labored to some purpose. What matters it, though he were to present a thousand testimonies, unless he can show that they involve the *endless duration* of punishment! They may even teach the doctrine of future suffering—that suffering may be protracted through a million of ages, and unless he can prove that it will never terminate, his labor will be in vain.

As I remarked, on last evening, this doctrine is one in which you are all *personally* interested. You are anxious to know whether the loved ones of the household are to be saved or damned. There was a mother in this city, on last Sabbath, whose child was suddenly taken sick. For the moment its life seemed poised on the balance between time and eternity! Her soul was wrung with anguish and despair! And all, in view of a *momentary* parting! But what would be her anguish, did she realize that possibly there may be an *endless parting* with her child? Now that mother—these mothers here to-night, all wish to know, whether their children will be as tenderly cared for, and loved with as deathless a love by the kind Father of all; or whether he will forsake them, and *compel* them to sin, and suffer eternally! My brother thinks it a terrible thing, that God should *force men into heaven!* but a small matter that he should *force them into hell!* Such a calamity he regards with perfect indifference.

Which would be best, to force them into heaven, or to force them into hell? In the parable of the lost sheep, we have a beautiful representation of God's love. Luke xv. 4: "What man among you, if he have an hundred sheep, and lose one, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it?" What does he do then? Does he act as Mr. Lozier represents God as acting? Does he say, you are a *free agent*—you may come if you please, or be forever lost? No, no! Verse 5: "And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing." He bears it back to the flock, and there is great rejoicing at the recovery of the sheep. So with God and man. Man is lost in a wilderness of sin and error, and if it becomes necessary, before he will abandon his creatures, God will put forth his almighty arm, and bear them back to the fold, of which Jesus is the shepherd.

As already remarked, on the last evening of the discussion, Mr. Lozier presented no arguments or testimonies bearing upon the proposition under investigation. To-night he has quoted quite an array of passages, and has endeavored to make some show, at least, of argument. He has introduced Isaiah lxvi. 24; Mark ix. 43–48; Daniel xii. 1–3; Mark iii. 28, 29; Matt. xiii. 36–42; 2 Thess. i. 6–10; Matt. xxv. 31–46; Rev. xiv. 9–11. In presenting these testimonies, Mr. Lozier acknowledges their parallelism—that they all teach the

same doctrine. It being impossible, in the short time allotted to me, to notice them all, I will take two or three, acknowledged to be the strongest; and if these do not teach the doctrine of endless punishment, the others will not. In not one instance, did he show that the passages, cited involve *endless punishment!* The very point to be proven, has been taken for granted, leaving it to the audience to make an application of them in accordance with their prejudices.

I shall first proceed to notice the testimony acknowledged to be the strongest, and most important—that in Matt. xxv. 31–46—the parable of the sheep and goats: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or

thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

Why did not Mr. Lozier, when quoting this parable, give the entire discourse in which it occurs? Why did he not consult the parallel testimonies bearing upon the subject? In the beginning of the parable—verses 31, 32—we find a "gathering of all nations" spoken of, and a separation, not of *individuals*, but of *nations!* The same "gathering of all nations," is referred to in Zech.

xiv. 1–5: "Behold the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. For I will *gather all nations against Jerusalem*, to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city. * * * And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains!" Our Saviour quotes from this very prophecy, in the preceding chapter of Matthew.

We are not told that the characters specified in the parable, were to inherit the kingdom because they had been born again, or because they had faith in the gospel, but in consequence of their good deeds. The everlasting life, and everlasting punishment, were each bestowed, in consequence of good deeds performed or neglected. But does Mr. Lozier believe that future salvation is the result of *works?* If so, what becomes of his doctrine of *grace?*

The discourse, of which this parable is the conclusion, commences with the twenty-fourth chapter; and by consulting the internal evidence of both chapters, it will be seen that he spoke with reference to a coming and judgment that was to take place during that generation. His disciples had shown him the buildings of the the temple; and he had told them of a time that was coming, when there should not be left one stone upon another, that should not be thrown

down. They then came to him privately, saying, "Master tell us when these things shall be, and what shall be the sign of *thy coming*, and of the *end of the world?*" What end? The end of the *aion* or age? By some, it is thought that reference is had to the personal coming of the Savior, and to the end of this material universe. Also, that there are two, if not three distinct questions propounded. By consulting the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, it will be seen that there is but one question; and that "these things," "thy coming," and "the end of the world," refer to the same event. In Mark xiii. 4, it is recorded thus: "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the *sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?*" In Luke xxi. 7, we read as follows: "And they asked him saying, Master, but *when shall these things be?* and what *sign will there be, when these things shall come to pass?*" Mark and Luke do not mention the *coming*, or the *end of the world!* And yet the answer is the same in both records. "Take heed that no man deceive you; for many shall *come* in my name, saying I am Christ; and shall deceive many. And *ye* shall hear of wars, and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all *these things* must come to pass, but *the end* is not yet." Here, in the answer, we find the "coming," "these things," and "the end of the world," all spoken of in the same connection, which would not have been the case, had the

Savior referred to different events. Again, these little words, "ye," and "you," and "yours," mean a great deal. They prove that he was speaking to his disciples, directly in reference to a coming or judgment, in which they were *personally* interested. In the 14th verse we read, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations: and *then* shall the *end* come!" What *end?* The same end of the world spoken of in verse 3d. Has the end come? Turn to Rom. x. 16, 18: "But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? Lo then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But I say have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went unto *all the earth*, and their words unto the *ends of the world!*" Again, in Col. i. 5, 6: "For the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel: Which is come *unto you* as it is *in all the world!*" See also verse 23, same chapter. Thus the gospel was preached for a "witness unto all nations," in the apostle's time. Turn now to the 15th verse of the chapter under consideration. "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand.) What was this abomination of desolation? Consult Daniel xii. 1, 2: "And at that time shall Michael stand up,

the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be *a time of trouble*, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." When was this "time of trouble"—this "abomination of desolation" spoken of, to take place? Consult verse 6th and 7th of same chapter: "And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the *end of these wonders?* And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth forever, that it shall be for a time, times and a half; and *when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished!*" The "end of these wonders," is the same *end* referred to in the xxiv. of Matthew. All these things were to be finished when the holy people were scattered, which occurred at the time God's judgment befel the Jewish nation, in the destruction of their city, and the overthrow of their polity. But we pass to Matt. xxiv. 29–31: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light,

and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heaven shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and and great glory. And he send his angels, with a great sound of the trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." See parallel passages in Mark xiii. 24–27: Luke xxi. 20–28. That this is the same coming spoken of in the parable of the sheep and goats there can be no doubt. The terms are synonymous. It is a coming in "glory," in "power,"—a coming with the "holy angels." You will observe the particular form of the metaphor here employed. "The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heaven shall be shaken!" Similar language was used by the Old Testament writers in reference to any great judgment or coming of God. In Isaiah xxxiv. 4, we read, "All the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and the falling fig from the fig tree. For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, *to judgment.*" The same metapor of the "darkening of

the *sun*, moon and *stars*" was employed in regard to the judgment threatened upon Babylon. Isaiah xiii. 9, 10. Also in reference to Egypt, Ezekiel xxxii. 7, it is said, "And when I shall put thee out, I will cover the heaven, and make the *stars* thereof *dark;* I will cover the *sun with a cloud,* and the *moon shall not give her light!*" But the prophecies from which our Saviour borrowed his metaphor are those of Daniel and Joel. In Joel ii. 30–32, we read, "And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The *sun* shall be turned into *darkness*, and the *moon into blood* before the *great and terrible day of the Lord come!* And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion, and in *Jerusalem* shall *be deliverance!*" See also Daniel vii. 9–14.

But when was this coming or judgment to take place? See Matt. xxiv. 32: "Verily I say unto you, *This generation shall not pass till these things be fulfilled!*" What things? The *coming in power and glory!* The *end of the world*, or age! But Mr. Lozier will doubtless tell us that the greek word *genea* here means *race*, as it sometimes has that rendering elsewhere; and therefore refers to the race of the Jews, which are still in existence. But let us examine other testimonies. The same coming is recorded in Matt. xvi. 27, 28: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of

his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, There be *some standing here that shall not taste of death*, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." The parallel passages may be found in Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26, 27. There is no greek word *genea*, found in these passages; no *race* spoken of. But he plainly declares that there were *some before him*, within the sound of his voice, who *should not taste death*, till they should *see him "coming in his kingdom!"* Do you ask for more proof? I call your attention to John xxi. 20–24: "Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved, following: (which also leaned on his breast at the supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee?) Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will *that he tarry till I come*, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that *that disciple should not die:* yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" Here it is implied that John would live until after he came in power and glory! See also Matt. x. 23: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, *Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come!*" Could language be plainer and more positive, than the

testimonies we have adduced, to show that the "end," the "coming in power and glory, with the holy angels," was to take place during that age, or generation? The Savior declares that that "*generation* should not *pass away*"—that there "were *some before him who should not see death*"—that the *disciples* were not to "have *journeyed over the cities of Israel*," until he should *come in power and glory!*

These testimonies fully determine the time when this parable of the sheep and goats was to have its fulfillment—in that *age* or *generation.* We now notice the closing verse: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." The words "everlasting" and "eternal" are the same in both instances, and are placed in antithesis; but they do not necessarily imply *endless duration*, in either case. John says, "*This is life eternal*, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." The everlasting punishment, was an age-lasting punishment. The end and aim of punishment being corrective, and designed to reform, it cannot be endless. Christ did not come literally or personally; but it was coming in "power and glory," to take vengeance on that nation, in the destruction of their city and temple, and in scattering them to the four winds of heaven!

The design of the parable then, was two-fold. It was intended to prefigure the separation which

should take place between the true and false professors of Christ's religion in that age, when he should come in judgment upon that nation. Those who had been faithful, who had watched for the signs of his coming, who had practised his religion, who had done the good deeds specified, would be accounted worthy to escape the calamities coming upon that generation—they should fully inherit the kingdom of God, or blessings of the gospel dispensation. While those who were unfaithful, who had not improved their privileges, who had neglected the good deeds referred to, who had been hypocritical in their professions, and had failed to watch for the signs of his coming, would be overwhelmed with the Jews in one common ruin! This was literally fulfilled. The true followers of the Savior were saved, and permitted to enter more completely into the gospel kingdom, while upon the ungodly professors, the wrath of God came to the uttermost! The "everlasting punishment" is synonymous with those judgments so frequently predicted in the Old Testament under the figure of *fire!* They were to experience a time of trouble such as never had been, nor ever should be again. The language of Daniel and the Savior was to be literally fulfilled! And this awful punishment they have been experiencing as a nation for a period of eighteen hundred years—a period longer than the Levitical priesthood, or covenant of circumcision, which were called "everlasting!" But

even this punishment is not to be *endless*, as will be seen by consulting Rom. xi. 25–32.

There are one or two other important facts connected with this parable, to which I desire to call Mr. Lozier's special attention. Mark and Luke, though they give the substance of chapters 24 and 25, of Matthew, do not mention the parable of the sheep and goats. Not one of the disciples even referred to it in any of their exhortations or warnings. Paul was a faithful witness of Jesus, and yet he never alluded to it in any of his epistles. If the doctrine of *endless punishment* was taught in it, why did not the disciples quote it in their writings?

Mr. Lozier will, no doubt, give us the parable of the rich man and Lazarus in his next speech. The same remarks will apply to that. Though it speaks of the rich man as being in hell, in torments, not one of the disciples ever quoted it in proof of the doctrine of endless punishment! Paul wrote the greater part of the New Testament—some fourteen epistles—and yet in all the record of his teachings, he never mentions the word *hell once!* And yet he tells us that "he shunned not to declare *all the counsel of God!*" Had the theory of endless hell torments been true, would not Paul have taught it? Most assuredly. Suppose Mr. Lozier were to preach even *two* or *three sermons* without mentioning the word *hell*, he would be charged at once with being a *Univer*

salist! And yet Paul, in all his writings, is silent upon the subject!

I shall now take up the case of Judas, which seems to trouble my opponent so much, and shall notice his strong testimonies. Matt. xxvi. 24: "The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him: but wo unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man had he not been born." Also John xvii. 12: "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them *is lost*, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled." What there is in these passages in support of the proposition, we are at a loss to conceive. The saying, "it were good for him had he not been born," was a common proverb among the Jews. It was frequently used with reference to any person who had suffered affliction, or any great calamity! It proves nothing, however, in regard to the doctrine of endless punishment. You will note the tense of the latter passage quoted: "None of them *is lost*, but the son of perdition." Judas was *already lost* as an apostle, and as a fellow co-worker with the apostles in the gospel ministry. The language had no reference, whatever, to his future condition.

Turn to the account in Matt. xxvii. 3–5: Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests

and elders, saying, I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? see thou to that. And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself." Here we find that Judas, when *he saw that the Savior was condemned, he repented*, and carried back the thirty pieces of silver, and threw them down in the temple, declaring that he had sinned, in that he had betrayed *innocent blood!* From this we infer, that Judas had no idea that the Savior would be *condemned.* That the act was not committed from any enmity or ill will that he had for Jesus. Hence, when he remembered his Master's kindness and love, so keen and pungent was his sorrow, that he repented, and did all that he could to atone for the wicked act. He carried back the thirty pieces of silver, and there, in that judgment hall, alone, of all the disciples, he declared the *innocence* of the Son of God! Where were the rest of the disciples? Where was James, and John, and Peter, and the others, whom Mr. Lozier believes are saved and blessed? Turn to Matt. xxvi. 6: "Then *all the disciples forsook him and fled!*" And even Peter *denied him*, and cursed and swore that he knew not the man! And yet *Peter* will be *saved*, and *Judas damned!* There is a stronger argument against the salvation of Peter than Judas. For Jesus says: "Him that denieth me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in

heaven!" Peter denied him thrice, and if this language is to be understood literally, then there is no hope for Peter.

But Mr. Lozier will, no doubt, admit the genuiness of the repentance of Judas; but will contend for his endless punishment, on the ground that he *hung himself*, or committed suicide! But does Mr. Lozier really believe that Judas hanged himself, and that it is in consequence of this act that he is to be damned? If so, I have some work for him to do. We have two accounts of the death of Judas. In Matt. xxvii. 5, we read: "And he cast down the pieces of siver in the temple, and departed, and went and *hanged himself*." In Acts i. 18, it is said: "Now this man purchased a field with the reward of his iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out!" Now, in the one passage it is said, he "hanged himself!" in the other, that he "fell headlong," and was killed in the fall. There is an apparent discrepancy in these two accounts of the death of Judas. If my opponent really believes that Judas hanged himself, I want him to reconcile these two passages. There is but one way in which it can be done; and that is on the ground that there is a wrong translation in one of them, which is the case with the passage found in Matthew. Commentators of note, among whom is Dr. Clarke, say that it should have been rendered, "was strangled," "suffocated with grief," or "choked

with anguish." This view of the subject, removes the apparent difficulty, and harmonizes the two passages. His sufferings were so intense, when he saw the magnitude of the crime, and realized his Master's innocence — when he remembered the great love of Jesus, his kindness, and good will, nature sank beneath the load of guilt, and he died of excessive grief and sorrow! We have no record upon the past or present history of the world, of a repentance like that of Judas! Look over your community, and see if you can find an individual, who has been guilty of wrong—who has defrauded the widow and the orphan, or amassed a fortune dishonestly, that has gone like poor Judas, and *carried back the thirty pieces*, making a full confession of his sins! Show me the man who has been guilty of these wrongs, who has made loud professions of repentance when he has joined the church, or been converted, according to Mr. Lozier's theory, that has made *full restitution for his extortions, or the wrong that he has done!* When you do this, then I will acknowledge that we have a parallel case to that of Judas!

With this I close for to-night; and would exhort you to dismiss your prejudices, and be governed by the weight of testimony in the argument presented. Do not take the mere assertion of the speaker, in proof of all he says, unless accompanied with testimonies that are plain and positive. "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."

SIXTH NIGHT.

MR. LOZIER'S THIRD SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I wish to make a remark or two at the outset, in regard to Mr. Foster's speech on Wednesday evening. It was a tissue of sophisms, and petty little quibbles, from beginning to end, and I do not propose to insult this intelligent audience by going into an explanation of the inconsistencies and absurdities with which he attempted to meet my arguments. Nor is it necessary that any such explanation should be made, for the whole thing was perfectly transparent to every man and woman possessed of common sense, and not utterly blinded by prejudice. I have certainly, for my own part, never seen so so much dust thrown in so short a time. There are a few points, however, that I will notice, lest the gentleman should try to make capital out of the omission, and lest some of

his ardent admirers should conclude, from my not noticing them, that his arguments were unanswerable.

In the first place, in regard to the effort he made to obscure from your view, (for he did not attempt to *meet* it) my argument founded on what is said in relation to the coming of Christ, his coming "in his glory," Matt. xxv. 31, and remaining verses of the chapter. The attempt he made to get rid of the overwhelming force of the declarations contained in that passage, by making them refer to the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, was miserably lame; it was pitiable, in the extreme. Says Matthew, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory." Mr. Foster says, "he came in his glory, at the destruction of Jerusalem." Very well; let us go a little further with Matthew, and see what he says. He says, "all the holy angels are to come with him; that the throne of his glory will be set, and he will sit upon it, and that all the nations of the earth shall be gathered together before him." Now, just here, Mr. Foster attempts to make a point on the word "nations." He takes that word as conclusive evidence that this passage cannot refer to a general judgment, for in that case it would be, not as nations, but as individuals that men would be gathered together and stand before God. This is a mere quibble. What difference does it make, whether they were nations or individuals? Those of them who were wicked,

were driven away into *everlasting punishment*, that is very sure. He may call it nations, or individuals, just as he pleases, the result will be the same, and alike fatal to his doctrine. Did Christ "come," at the destruction of Jerusalem? Did he "sit upon the throne of his glory?" Were "*all* nations gathered together before him?" Did he "separate the sheep from the goats?" The idea that that passage refers to any thing but a final judgment of the entire human race, is too preposterous and absurd to deserve an answer.

In trying to do away with the parable, Mr. Foster disputes the authenticity of the Bible, and says, neither Mark nor Luke record it, and asks if they were not as truthful historians as Matthew; thus, by imputation, calling Matthew's veracity in question. I am quite willing to trust Matthew in preference to Mr. Foster. In relation to the statement, that in "thirty years of preaching," St. Paul never mentioned Matthew's parable, I will say, that Paul wrote his letters *one year before* Matthew wrote his gospel, and it was easy to see why Paul could not quote what was not yet written.

Mr. Foster has a great depth of affection for the disciples, especially Judas. Of all the twelve, he tells us, Judas was the most faithful—he staid with Christ when all the rest had fled—and if he did sin against his Lord, his repentance was one of the most genuine instances of repentance to be

found upon record. Now, it may be necessary to remind the gentleman that we are not disputing about the repentance of Judas. The question is, was, or is Judas *lost?* After all Mr. Foster's talk about Judas, his faithfulness, and his genuine repentance for the one trivial fault of selling his Savior for thirty pieces of silver, he has never yet touched the question, was Judas lost? That is the only connection Judas has with this discussion; and as Mr. Foster has not touched the question of Judas' salvation, or damnation, he cannot claim to have, in the least, discredited the argument I presented, based on the eternal damnation of the betrayer of Christ.

With the exception of these feeble attempts to get rid of Christ's description of the final judgment, as given by Matthew, and the case of the son of perdition, and a few more glittering and specious generalities, not one of all the ten arguments I presented, on last Wednesday night, have been even touched by my opponent.

God's punishments, says he, are always reformatory in their character, not judicial or vindictive. That may be a well sounding phrase to catch the ear and captivate the soul, and lull it into the fatal sleep that ends in death, but it will not bear the searching light of truth, of scripture or experience. From the time when God, for the wickedness of man, destroyed nearly the entire race from off the face of the earth by a deluge, down to the present

time, the past is full of instances of the total destruction of the wicked, by the fierce anger of the Almighty. Look at the case recorded in 1st Sam. vi. 19: "And he smote the men of Beth-shemesh, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people fifty thousand and three score and ten men; and the people lamented, because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter." Now, in this case, either God acted as "an indulgent father," as Mr. Foster expresses it, or else as a sovereign executive or judge. If the latter, Mr. Foster's position is lost; if the former, he will please explain to us how the slaughtering of those fifty thousand men "reformed" them under his system of "disciplinary punishment."

Mr. Foster seemed to be very much troubled about the parable of Dives and Lazarus. Luke xvi. 19–31: "There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously every day. * * * And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died, and was buried: And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." Here are the points: "The rich man died and was buried." So what happened to him, came *after* death and burial. Mr. Foster has distinctly defined *two* hells that he believes in, and strongly hinted at a third. First he located his hell in the future state, beyond the judgment, where Christ's

love would bring them to repentance and happiness at last. Second, he located hell between death and the resurrection, at which, very strangely, *all* were to arise purified and holy, notwithstanding that during the interim, the body was to lie *unconscious* in the grave, and the soul to be happy. Mr. Foster's third hell was in this life, wherein he strongly intimated that men received all their punishment, but did not tell us *how*. Now, in this parable, Christ illustrates, in metaphor, the state of the good and bad after death. *Dives* means a rich man. *Lazarus* means a poor man, or a *helpless* man. The rich man had reveled in luxury, and disregarded the helplessness of the poor. He dies and is buried. "In hell he lifted up his eyes being in torment." Then *that* spoils Mr. Foster's hell in *this* life, for here is a hell after death. It also spoils Mr. Foster's purifying process under the superior displays of Christ's love, for Dives thought it was a "horrible place." Take a common sense view of the matter. Suppose you were to set off one ward in the city of Indianapolis, and there shut up all the low thieves and prostitutes and villains of every grade, raise an impassable barrier between them and all good people, and thus make it as much worse than the "Five Points" of New York as that place is worse than the same places in Indianapolis, what sort of a place would that be to cultivate and perfect holiness? If it is a good place, then, by analogy, the

brothel is a better school of virtue, than your virtuous homes and your sanctuaries.

But Dives said he was fearfully tormented; and further along in the parable, he wanted water to "cool his parched tongue." But Abraham, or Christ, through the parable, said, "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot, neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." This spoils Mr. Foster's reformatory hell, where men can be made holy after suffering "a thousand years, or a million ages." These are Christ's words, and his infinite mind took in all of eternity. If men who were in hell could get out by any process, he would not have so positively stated that they could not pass who would, "to us from thence." Mr. Foster makes no difference between God's "chastisements," which are *corrective*, and his "punishments," which are *judicial*. If a child of God grows careless and unfaithful, God may, and often does, lay his chastisements upon such to bring them back. If a sinner rejects God's love, and "being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, he shall suddenly be cut off, and that without remedy."

Punishments do not bring such sinners to repentance. Hear John upon this subject: Rev. xvi. 8–9: "And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire, and men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God,

which hath power over these plagues: and they repented not to give him glory." See also verses 10–12, of the same chapter: "And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast: and his kingdom was full of darkness, and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven, because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds. And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared." Jesus Christ himself said, nearly two thousand years ago: "Whosoever is ashamed of me in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels." Mark viii. 38. If they are to be changed and made holy before the resurrection, why will he be ashamed of them?

Again, in Matt. x. 14–15, we have an expression of Christ in regard to Sodom and Gomorrah, that has a bearing upon this point. He there says to his disciples: "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city."

Perhaps the most remarkable of all Mr. Foster's remarkable positions; or at least among the most

remarkable of them, was that, where he instituted a comparison between Judas Iscariot and Peter, at the expense of Peter. He pointed us to Matt. xxvi. 56: "Then all the disciples forsook him and fled," Peter among the rest. Judas was the only one that stayed behind to tell the judges that Christ was innocent. Then he told us how Peter denied him not once only, but three different times; and how he cursed and swore he did not know him at all, and so on. And then, says he, "Christ said, he that denieth me before men, him will I deny before my Father and the holy angels." What was his conclusion? Peter is *damned!* He denied Christ, and Christ will deny him. So Mr. Foster damns Peter to save Judas. But he does not save him after all, for Judas too denied Christ before Peter did, and therefore he is damned according to Mr. Foster's own showing. Peter's bitter repentance, his subsequent faithful services, and his final martyrdom for the sake of Christ—all go for nothing according to Mr. Foster's theory. Peter and Judas both denied Christ, and both are damned—it is damnation after all, any way you can fix it.

Paul, in Hebrews vi. 4–6, says: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted of the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to

renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." If it is "impossible to renew them unto repentance," how are they going to be saved? Will Mr. Foster please tell us that? He does not pretend that they will ever get out of his reformatory hell unless they *repent.* St. Paul says they cannot be led to repent—that it is *impossible;* and I take it that "impossible" means *impossible.* Mr. Foster, however, differs from Paul, and says it is *possible*, and that it *will be done.* I will point you also to what Christ says, Matt. xii. 45: "Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; and *the last state of that man is worse than the first.*"

It will be recollected that in my opening speech, on last Monday night, I brought forward an argument that no human being to whom the gospel is intelligibly preached will be saved, if he wilfully and persistently reject it—an argument supported by Christ's words: "He that believeth not *shall be* damned"—not *is* damned—and many similar passages of scripture to the same intent. To that argument, up to this moment Mr. Foster has never replied. It is *the one great question* that *he will not* answer: Shall the wilful rejecter of Christ and his gospel be saved? Did Paul tell the truth when he said to the Ephesians: "By grace are ye saved through faith."—Eph. ii. 8. Or,

on the other hand, can men be saved who deliberately and wilfully, and persistently reject the gospel and *will not* believe? This is the question that most intimately concerns immortal beings, and I call upon Mr. Foster, for the sake of the souls of those who hear him, to tell them plainly and in the fear of God, whether any of them can be saved without faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and obedience to his teachings. I repeat the inquiry: *Can a person be saved without obedience and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ*, unless that person be a heathen, an infant or an idiot? This is the one vital and all-important question, upon which it behooves us to be candid and honest, if upon no other. If Mr. Foster will not answer any other question, let him answer this one.

Again, as to a future judgment, Paul says God "hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." In Acts xxiv. 25, we are told that Paul before Felix, "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and *judgment to come.*" The same idea, of a judgment to come is set forth in Romans ii. 4–6: "Or despiseth thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance! But after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the

righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds." According to Paul the judgment is *to come;* according to Mr. Foster it is past.

What is the proof he brings to show that the judgment is not future? Why, Christ said, when the judgment of this world was about to condemn him to the death of the cross: "Now is the judgment of this world." As much as to say: "You are judging now." But Christ did not stop there; he continued, verse 49, "I come, not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same *shall* judge him, *at the last day.*" This explains what John says in Rev. xx. 12–15: "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire." This is the Bible account of the final condition of the wicked. I warn you, my hearers, not to listen for a

moment to the siren song of Universalism, but receive the words of Paul to the Gal. vi. 7–8: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap! for he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

MR. FOSTER'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

RESPECTED FRIENDS:

I do not propose in this, my closing speech, to follow Mr. Lozier in his uncharitable insinuations about my doctrine, or in his attempts to excite the prejudices of the audience, by gross carricatures and misrepresentations. He has cause to thank the reporter, that many of the rough and harsh expressions, used in his speech of Wednesday evening, were stricken out before it went to press. His allusion to my old book, and manuscripts, are not worthy of a notice. I would inform him, however, that the old book, about which he is so nervous, is none other than the *word of God*, which is sharper than a two edged sword! Whatever may have been my fate, in the discussions alluded to by my

opponent, this large and intelligent audience, will be the judges as to how I stand upon the present occasion.

You will bear in mind the fact, that Mr. Lozier has ignored the argument I founded upon the justice of God. My position was, that God's justice was infinitely perfect. That the simple idea of justice was *right*—that whatever is wrong in the moral world, was to be righted, and all opposing influences to man's happiness destroyed. That God's justice demanded the final holiness and happiness of all intelligent beings! That God's law was founded in justice; and that there was no penalty annexed to it, that would in any wise subvert its benevolent design. Several testimonies were presented, showing the harmony between God's justice and mercy. That the one demanded no more than was sanctioned by the other. That the very idea of justice, presupposes that a time must come when its demands will be satisfied, which cannot be the case, if the doctrine of endless punishment is true. But this argument Mr. Lozier has failed to notice.

My negative argument on the *certainty* of rewards and punishments, has met the same fate with that on the divine justice. I endeavored to show, upon the hypothesis of Mr. Lozier's doctrine, that it destroyed all *certainty* in the administration of rewards and punishments. That an individual might live a life of virtue and goodness for fifty

years, and yet one step aside from the path of obedience, was all that was required to consign him to endless punishment! While on the other hand, an individual may live a life of profligacy and wickedness, and yet be saved on the ground of repentance, even though it come just before death. So that in the one case, there is no reward for the good deeds; and in the other, no punishment for the evil deeds of half a century! While the scriptures proclaim the fact, that "we are to receive *according to that we have done, whether good or bad!*" I offered these arguments as incontrovertible proofs against the proposition, and yet Mr. Lozier has failed to meet them.

In my reply to Mr. Lozier's speech of Wednesday evening, I noticed two or three of the most prominent testimonies, upon which he predicated his argument. By quoting them in the same connection, he acknowledged them to be parallel. I now propose briefly noticing those, that for want of time, were passed over. Nor can I give a full exposition of either of them. I shall only show that they do not teach the doctrine of *endless punishment!*

The first passage introduced in proof of the proposition, was Isaiah lxvi. 24: "And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

The parallel passages may be found in Mark ix. 43–48: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." This language of the Savior was quoted without comment. Why did not Mr. Lozier read the 23d verse of Isaiah lxvi? "And it shall come to pass from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, all flesh shall come and worship before me saith the Lord; and they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched!" This *fire* that was not to be quenched, was in a place where there are *new moons* and *sabbaths!* Will Mr. Lozier inform us whether there are *new moons* and *sabbaths* in *eternity?* If not, why does he quote this passage in support of the proposition? The Savior, in Mark ix., meant no more than the

prophet. He referred to the punishment or judgment that was to befal that *generation.* The fire alluded to was called hell-fire, or gehenna fire! Why did he not attempt to show that *gehenna* here had reference to the future state, and that its *punishment* was *endless!* He assumes the very point to be proven. The word gehenna, rendered hell, in the passage under consideration, occurs but *twelve times* in the New Testament. Seven times it is found in Matthew, three times in Mark, once in Luke, and once in James. The Savior and James are the only two persons who ever used it! The phrase hell-fire was never used when addressing the Gentiles. John wrote his gospel for their benefit, and yet he makes no mention of it. Paul was a preacher of the Gentiles, and yet in the history of his preaching in Acts, nor in his fourteen epistles, is there any record of it! If the doctrine of endless punishment was taught in the phrase, why did they not declare it? Let Mr. Lozier answer these questions. Only *twice* was the word used when addressing the Jews. In every other instance where it is found, he was addressing his *own disciples!* So much for the passages in Isaiah and Mark.

We come now to Matt. x. 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Upon this passage, as in the case of those already noticed,

Mr. Lozier based his argument upon assumption. The same word *gehenna* is here used. Why does he not show that it is beyond death and the resurrection, and *endless* in its existence? But mark the language of Jesus: "But rather fear him which *is able* to *destroy* both *soul* and *body in hell!*" If the passage refers to the future state, and the soul and body refer to the *immortal spirit*, and *mortal body* of man—and the destruction is to be understood in a literal sense, can the doctrine of *endless punishment* be true? The *immortal spirit* and *mortal body both destroyed!* How, then, can they suffer? So that in this view of the case, there is nothing in this passage to sustain the proposition. Again, it is certain that the Savior referred to the principle which is called the *immortal spirit?* The word in the passage under consideration, rendered *soul*, is *pseuche*, which is sometimes rendered merely animal life. Turn to Matt. ii. 10: "They are dead which sought the young child's *life!*" But did they seek the *immortal spirit* of the child? The same word occurs in Matt. vi. 25: "Take no thought for your *life* (pseuche) what ye shall eat. Is not the *life* more than meat?" That the sacred writers made a clear distinction between *soul* and *spirit*, is evident. 1st Thess. v. 23: "I pray God, your whole *spirit*, and *soul*, and *body*, be preserved blameless, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Once more, Heb. iv. 12: "For the word of God is quick

and powerful, and shaper than any two edged sword, piercing, even to the dividing asunder of SOUL and SPIRIT!" The word rendered *spirit*, is nowhere used in connection with *gehenna* or *hell!* The spirit is never said to be destroyed in *hell!* I call upon Mr. Lozier to show *one passage* where it is said that the *spirit* of man is to be *destroyed* or *tormented in hell!* The prophet says of the spirit: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the *spirit* shall return unto God who gave it!" And you nowhere read of a spirit going anywhere else, but to the God who created it!

The passage in Dan. xii. 1, 2, was noticed on Wednesday evening, in connection with the parable of the sheep and goats. You will bear in mind my remarks upon that occasion, as it is not necessary that I should repeat them at this time.

Next comes the *parable of the tares*, Matt. xiii. 36–43: "Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The

Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; And shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear."

In this parable, we have the "Son of man," the "devil," the "angels," the "furnace of fire," and the "end of the world!" In Matt. xxiv. and xxv. chapters, noticed on the last evening of discussion, we have the same events and characters spoken of, and the time of their fulfillment set forth. In the parable of the sheep and goats, we have the "coming of the Son of man, with his holy angels"—the separation of the *wheat* and *tares*, under the figure of *sheep* and *goats!* the "devil," and the "furnace of fire," as well as the "everlasting punishment," which corresponds with the "burning of the tares!" Those of you who were present on the last night of discussion, will remember, that we presented quite a number of testimonies showing that the "coming of Christ," and "end of the world," or age, took place *during that generation.* Mr. Lozier will not deny that the same *end of the world* is spoken of in the parable of the tares, that we find in Matt. xxiv. 3: "What is the sign of thy coming, and of the *end of the world?*" In the parable of the tares we read,

"The harvest is the *end of the world!*" By keeping in mind the testimonies adduced on last evening, you will readily understand the design and meaning of this parable of the tares. Jesus was warning them of that great calamity that was coming upon the Jewish nation in the end of that age, or dispensation. And "fire," as well as "furnace of fire," and "everlasting fire," was borrowed from the prophets of old, when denouncing this judgment of heaven! In Ezek. xxii. 18–22, we have this strong and emphatic language upon the subject: "Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross: all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the *furnace;* they are even the dross of silver. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Because ye are all become dross, behold, therefore, *I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem.* As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather you in mine anger, and in my fury, and I will leave you there, and melt you. Yea, I will gather you, and blow upon you in the *fire of my wrath,* and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof; and ye shall know that I the Lord have *poured out my fury upon you!*" This passage is plain, and needs no comment. In Isaiah xxxi. 9, we read of this *furnace of fire!* "And he shall

pass over to his strong-hold for fear, and his princes shall be afraid of the ensign, saith the Lord, whose *fire* is in Zion, and his *furnace in Jerusalem!*" See also Deut. iv. 20. 1st Kings viii. 51. Here we find the "*furnace of fire*," without going to the eternal world. And this is the same figure used in the parable of the tares. This punishment, as well as that recorded in Matt. xxv., was to take place in that generation—during the lifetime of some of those present, when the words fell from the Savior's lips.

We come now to Mark iii. 28, 29: "Verily I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Why did not Mr. Lozier quote the parallel passage in Matt. xii.? This would have thrown some light on the text presented. Matt. xii. 31, 32: "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." In the passage in Mark, it reads, "*hath never forgiveness! but is in danger of eternal damnation!*" It does not say, will *suffer endless*

punishment! In Matt. xii., it says, "shall not be forgiven, neither in *this world*, (*aion*) neither in *the world* (*aion*) *to come!*" That is, neither under that *age*, nor the *age to come!* It has no reference to the *eternal world!* But does Mr. Lozier himself, think that the sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be forgiven under any circumstances? If so, then I will place him at issue with the apostle, where he says, "The blood of Christ *cleanseth from all sin!*" the sin against the Holy Ghost not excepted. Dr. Clarke also says, that this sin can be forgiven. Let him read the Doctor's comments upon the passage under consideration. By consulting verse 31, the subject will appear plain: "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men!" That is, all other sins are more *readily* or *easily forgiven*, than the sin against the Holy Ghost. Even admitting that this sin could not be forgiven "neither in this world, neither in the world to come," may it not be forgiven in the *worlds to come?* The apostle says, Eph. ii. 7: "That in the *ages* (aions—worlds) *to come*, he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness toward us, through Christ Jesus."

Mr. Lozier again calls up the case of Judas, not satisfied with his previous efforts to prove his damnation. I have already said all that is necessary

to be said on this case. The points that I have made, he has failed to touch. I called upon him to reconcile the two accounts of his death, which he has failed to do. I have already shown that the phrase, "It were good for him had he not been born," was a proverbial one among the Jews, when any one suffered affliction, or any great calamity! That no reference is had to the future condition of Judas. That he was *lost* as an apostle, and as a fellow co-laborer with the rest of the disciples. I referred you to the testimony of Dr. Clarke, who, with all his research and investigation of the case of Judas, could find no *positive evidence* of his *final damnation!* He says: "I find no *positive evidence* of the *final damnation of Judas, in the sacred text!!* And yet, Mr. Lozier finds it an easy matter to prove his *endless damnation!* Shall we rest the *final destiny* of an immortal being, upon testimony that is not *positive?* Upon testimony of an *implied* or *doubtful character?* I trust not.

I shall now proceed to examine his strong testimony in Rev. xiv. 9, 10: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone, in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment

ascendeth up for ever and ever." Here we find a torment with "fire and brimstone"—this "lake of fire," of which Mr. Lozier has had so much to say—this "torment that ascendeth up forever and ever!" By a close attention to the subject, it will be seen that this *lake of fire*, terrible, as it may be, is nevertheless, *in this world!* We read in Rev. xix. 20: "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet, that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the *mark of the beast*, and them that worshipped his image. These *both* were CAST ALIVE into the *lake of fire and brimstone!*" Allowing this passage to refer to the future world, we find both the *beast* and *false prophet cast alive* into *this lake of fire!* neither of whom had experienced the *power of a resurrection!* If this view be correct, what becomes of Mr. Lozier's doctrine of the *resurrection* and *judgment?* For neither of these characters are represented as having been *dead, or raised from the dead!* In Rev. xx. 10, we have the same *lake of fire*: "And the devil which deceived them was cast into the *lake of fire and brimstone*, where the beast and false prophet are, and shall be tormented *day and night*, forever and *ever!*" If there are *days and nights in eternity*, then this lake of fire, and the punishment in it are there; but not otherwise. This is the same fire referred to in Matt. xxv. 41; Matt. xiii. 42; Ezek. xxii. 17–22.

The expression, *lake of fire and brimstone*, occurs

nowhere in the Bible except in the book of Revelation. *Fire and brimstone* are used in different parts of the Bible, and always represent God's punishments, afflictions, and trials in this life! In Job xviii. 15, it is said, when speaking of the wicked, "*Brimstone* shall be scattered upon his habitation." In Psalms xi. 6, we read: "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, *fire and brimstone*, and an horrible tempest; this shall be the portion of their cup!" No allusion to *eternity!* In Isaiah xxxiv. 9, 10, it is recorded, in reference to Idumea: "And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into *brimstone*, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched *night nor day;* the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever!" Ezekiel, when speaking of the disobient and wicked, declares that the Lord will send upon them an "overflowing rain, and great hail stones, *fire and brimstone!*"

Dr. Clarke seemed to think the *lake of fire in this world*, as well as the torment experienced in it. He says, in his comment on Rev. xix. 20, 21: "That worshipped his image. The beast has been represented as the *Latin empire;* the image of the beast, the Popes of Rome; and the false prophet, the Papal clergy. Were *cast alive into the lake of fire;* were discomfitted when alive, in the zenith of their power, and *destroyed* with an UTTER DESTRUCTION!"

Now, it matters not what punishment was spoken of in Revelation, the very internal evidence of the book shows that it was *near at hand!* That the events recorded were to have their fulfillment during that *age* or *generation!* And as Mr. Lozier has relied much upon this book of Revelation, and has had so much to say about the "*lake of fire*," and "torment with *fire and brimstone*," I shall examine for a moment the internal evidence, from which it will be seen that the "judgment" and "torment" so frequently mentioned in it were *shortly to take place!* In Rev. i. 1, we read: "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants *things which must shortly come to pass!*" Again, in Rev. xi. 8, it is said: "And their dead bodies shall be in the street of the *great city*, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, *where also our Lord was crucified!*" In the closing chapter of the book, xxii. 10–12, when he was about to seal it up, the angel said unto him, "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: FOR THE TIME IS AT HAND! He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And *behold, I come quickly!* and my *reward is with me, to give to every man according as his works shall be!*" In the last verse he adds: "He which testifieth these things, saith, *Surely I come quickly!*" Compare this lan-

guage with Matt. xvi. 27–28: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall *reward every man according to his works!* Verily I say unto you, There be *some standing here*, which *shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom!*" Here is the same coming, and the same reward spoken of by the Revelator, that was "*shortly to come to pass!*" that was then "*near at hand!*" The time was then rapidly approaching, when the judgment and coming to take vengeance on that nation, should be consummated.

But as I am anxious to make this subject as plain as possible, I will call your attention to other testimonies from the Epistles—testimonies which were written within a short time of that great calamity that befel the Jewish nation, in the destruction of their city and temple, and in the overthrow of their peculiar institutions. In James v. 8, 9, we read: "Be *ye* (my disciples,) also patient; stablish your hearts; for the *coming of the Lord draweth nigh!* Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned, (or damned,) for *behold, the judge standeth at the door!*" He addresses them as though it were a matter in which they were *personally interested—a coming and judgment* then near at hand! He was anxious for their safety from that terrible calamity coming upon that nation. Another strong testimony may be found in 1st John ii. 18: "Little children, *it is the last*

time; and as ye have heard that anti-christ shall come — *even now*, are there many anti-christs; *whereby we know it is the last time!*" Peter says in his first epistle, chapter iv. 7: "But the *end of all things is at hand!*" Paul writing to the Hebrews, says, chapter x. 37: "For *yet a little while*, and he that shall come, *will come, and will not tarry!*" Now, all these testimonies, and many others that we might adduce, were uttered on the eve of that great judgment that befel the Jewish nation—a judgment to which our Savior, in his teachings, was so constantly calling their attention, and urging upon them the duty of watchfulness, that they might escape it! Language could not have been employed more plain and pointed, showing that the coming of Christ in judgment, upon that nation, was an event near at hand! I hope Mr. Lozier will notice these testimonies, as upon them we are willing to rest the issue of the coming of Christ and the judgment under consideration.

I shall now notice briefly the parable of the rich man, Luke xvi. 19–31: "There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: And there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores. And desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar

died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and was buried: And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue: for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime, receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And, besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house: For I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come unto this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." What there is in this parable, in support of the proposition, I am at a loss to conceive. Mr. Lozier did not attempt a criticism upon the word hell—nor is there a word in the parable involving the *duration*

of punishment. The rich man is here represented as being in *hades*, (hell) not *gehenna*—and it is contended by Dr. Campbell, and other eminent commentators, that *gehenna*, and not *hades*, is the place of future and endless torment. Also, that the punishment in *gehenna* does not take place until *after the resurrection!* Here we have the rich man *in hell*, suffering torment, without ever having been *raised from the dead!* There is no hint in the whole account, of the *resurrection* of either the *rich man or Lazarus!* Even admitting that *hades* is a place of punishment, it is intermediate between death and the resurrection, and therefore cannot be endless in duration. Let Mr. Lozier make a note of this fact! Again, the *rich man* is not only in *hades*, or hell, but *Abraham* and *Lazarus are in the same place!* We are not told that the one was in heaven, and the other in hell. Both are spoken of as being close together —*within speaking distance!* But are such the ideas of the present day? Farther—if Jesus had intended to inculcate the idea that *hades* or *hell*, in the parable before us, was a place of torment, and endless in duration, his apostles would doubtless have comprehended it. But how did they understand the Savior? Not an instance is to be found in all their writings, where they ever alluded to it, or spoke of *hades*, as a place of endless torment for any soul in God's universe. They heard this parable; and if the doctrine of endless misery is

taught in it, why do we not find it throughout their writings? And it will be remembered, that what our Lord taught in parables, they were to proclaim in language that could not be misunderstood. You may examine the various epistles written to the different churches, and in not one of them will you find any allusion to the parable of the rich man. Could there be any apology for their silence, if the doctrine of *endless punishment* was taught in the parable? So far from this being the case, the most eminent and distinguished commentators that have ever written upon the Bible, say that *hades* in its original and primitive signification, means not a *state of torment*, but the state of death in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of persons, their happiness or misery! Wakefield says the "universal meaning of *hades* (hell) is a *state of death!*" Dr. Campbell says, "In my judgment *hades ought never to be rendered hell*—at least in the *sense wherein that word is now universally understood by christians!*" And yet, this is the word upon which Mr. Lozier predicates his argument in favor of endless punishment. How does it happen that this is the only place in the Bible where *hades* signifies a place of torment? It is admitted that other passages, where the word occurs, teach an entirely different sentiment. Suppose any other important doctrine of the christian church were taught in only *one passage*, and that in a *parable*, would it afford any

sure foundation for faith in it? We have not the time to give the parable a further notice—nor is it necessary, as Mr. Lozier has presented no argument based upon it, involving the *duration of punishment!* Let him notice our objections, and remove them if he can.

But the time has arrived, when this debate, so far as I am concerned, is to to terminate. The Moderators will permit me to thank them for the fair and impartial manner in which they have presided over our deliberations. They will ever be remembered with feelings of gratitude and respect. And to the audience, who have listened so patiently, and with so much interest, I would also tender my acknowledgments. Though many of you may differ with me in sentiment, yet I trust that it is an honest difference; and that whatever of feeling may have been manifested in the excitement of the occasion, will not mar that harmony that should ever exist among members of the same great family. My prayer is, that God may overrule our deliberations to the good of all assembled, and cause his truth to prosper abundantly. And to my brother, with whom I have held this pleasant interview, I would extend my cordial and fraternal greeting; and would give him my right hand, as a pledge that I entertain toward him none other than the kindest feeling. And though we may not see eye to eye now, yet I have faith in the overruling providence of God,

that he will ultimately cause all heart's to bask in the sunbeams of his love! My prayer is, that God may bless him abundantly, in every good word and work.

MR. LOZIER'S CLOSING SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

In closing this debate, I shall not consume any of the little time that is allotted me, in replying to what Mr. Foster has said this evening, in answer to the arguments that I advanced in the commencement of the debate, upon this second proposition. I do not consider any reply necessary. It must be apparent to every body, at a single glance, that if all the texts of scripture that I quoted, in relation to the end of the wicked, were fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem, there is not much left—we have no evidence whatever to prove that the world will ever be destroyed at all. That is a legitimate conclusion, from what he says, and it effectually does away with all his finely turned rhapsodies about universal happiness in a future state. Comment is unnecessary. The idea is so wild, that it only needs to be glanced at to be set aside as ridiculous.

No less remarkable was the position he took in regard to Matt. x. 28, which I had quoted as evidence of a future state of punishment. He tells us there is a difference between the soul of man, and the spirit of man; that the soul is only the same thing as the animal life, while the immortal principle of man's nature is the *spirit.* The passage referred to (Matt. x. 28,) reads thus, as it now stands: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the *soul;* but rather fear him which is able to destroy both *soul* and body in hell." But how will it read with Mr. Foster's emendation? He says the word *soul* means *life.* There can be great harm, then, in substituting one word for the other. Let us put in *life*, instead of soul, in this passage, and we shall have it reading like this: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the *life;* but rather fear him which is able to destroy both *life* and body in hell!" It would be difficult to imagine anything more palpably absurd.

Mr. Foster has taken occasion several times during the progress of the debate, to criticize my deportment and demeanor. Just how much he relied upon that kind of thing to prove his doctrine of universal salvation, can only be conjectured; but he seemed to think these personal reflections of very great consequence, to say the least. I do not know whether he would regard his wholesale, unblushing charge of plagiarism, and his subsequent

refusals to either retract it, or prove it to be true, as an instance of christian courtesy, worthy of universal imitation or not. If he does so regard it, I have only to say that we differ on that, no less than on Universalism, and I would no sooner be found following in his footsteps there, than I would trust to his theology for salvation. Christian courtesy is a matter that is capable of receiving abundant illustration from the Bible. The Pharisees and Sadducees came in crowds to John, to be baptized of him in Jordan; and when John saw them coming, he called them a "generation of vipers," and asked them who had "warned *them* to flee from the wrath to come?" That seems rather pointed than otherwise; yet there is no statement on record, that they got mad, or berated John for his lack of christian courtesy, and the reasonable presumption is, that they quietly submitted to be called by their right names. When the enemies of Christ beset him with snares, and sought by their craft and cunning to get him to say something on which they might found an accusation against him, Christ told them, "Ye are of your father, the devil," and who has there been to find fault with Christ for telling the plain truth? Even the hypocritical professors themselves had nothing to say on the subject, so far as we know. Why all this talk about christian courtesy? Why Paul, when acting under the direct influence of the Holy Ghost, said to Elymas, the sorcerer,

when he dared to wag his impious tongue in opposition to the gospel: "O, full of all subtlety and mischief, *thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness*, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" What a howl of Universalist indignation would have been raised, if I had used as plain, pointed, searching language as that, in reference to his perverting and mangling the word of God, as he has done, all through this debate. No doubt, if I had told the plain truth about him and his doctrines, with a little less reserve even than I did, (and I confess I have been tolerably plain,) he would have had a great deal more to say on that branch of the Universalist controversy, which treats of theological ethics and christian courtesy. I am not conscious of having treated Mr. Foster otherwise than as a gentleman, at any time during the debate. Personally, I consider him a gentleman; but with respect to his calling, I regard him as an unscrupulous theological demagogue. Personally, I shall always treat him with the same degree of respect that I expect him to manifest towards me.

This side talk about a subject that ought never to have been introduced, has consumed so much of my time, that I shall not attempt to embrace in a recapitulation all the arguments advanced upon the affirmative side of the question; and indeed, it would be wholly unnecessary to go over my argument from the *goodness of God*, his

justice, his *holiness*, and his *truth;* for Mr. Foster found it much easier to brush past it, and call it "cold, speculative theology," than to refute it; and he did not attempt a refutation. He did this, however: he had the effrontery to tell this audience at one time, that I had not produced a solitary argument in favor of my doctrine. Whether that is true or not, the audience will decide. The question will be, whether no arguments were produced, or whether the trouble was, that he could not understand them. If he did understand what was advanced, it would have been an easy task to show *why* and *how* it was not argument.

He has made several efforts to pump up your sympathies to the water point, and told you about some woman's baby that nearly died last Sunday. He also drew a picture of the broken family circles that are made by my doctrine, when, in fact, it is the only doctrine that gives us a remedy for the very evils he deplores, or that will stand the test of sound criticism.

The case of Judas has given him more trouble than he bargained for, when he undertook to bring him out of that place where inspiration has left him. He regards him as the best one of the twelve—even as better than St. Peter. According to his view, Judas, suffocating with grief at the loss of his Lord, fell and burst wide open, and all his bowels gushed out! "O, what a fall was there, my countrymen!" Did he stop to pick up

his bowels, and carry them to heaven with him? [Hisses by the audience.] The geese, you know, will hiss!

Mr. Foster has not touched the arguments I have presented, but has made special pleas, and attempted an *alibi* in the face of his own rule. He has traveled out of his way to drag me into this discussion; and if, during the debate, the lion's skin has frightened us, it has been stripped off, with the aid of the sword of the spirit, and the true character of the animal revealed.

WESTERN
UNIVERSALIST CHURCH & SUNDAY SCHOOL

Book Establishment, Cincinnati, Ohio.

WILLIAMSON & CANTWELL, publishers of the "*Star in the West*," are now the owners of the Stereotype plates of the following Universalist Books, and will hereafter publish them at their office in Cincinnati:

WILLIAMSON'S WORKS.

ARGUMENT FOR CHRISTIANITY. In a Series of Discourses. By I. D. Williamson, D. D. 18mo. 252 pages. Price 65 cents.

EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE of Universalism. In a Series of Discourses. By I. D. Williamson, D. D. 18mo. Price 65 cents.

ENDLESS MISERY Examined and Refuted. By I. D. Williamson, D. D. 12mo. 216 pages. Price 75 cents.

SERMONS FOR THE PEOPLE. By I. D. Williamson, D. D. 18mo.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNIVERSALISM; or Reasons for our Faith. By I. D. Williamson, D. D. Paper Covers. 96 pages. Price 35 cents.

CHAPIN'S WORKS.

CHRISTIANITY THE PERFECTION OF TRUE MANLINESS. By E. H. Chapin, D. D. 12mo. Price 85 cents.

MORAL ASPECTS OF CITY LIFE. A Series of Lectures. By E. H. CHAPIN, D. D. 12 mo. Price 85 cents.

SELECT SERMONS, preached in the Broadway Church. By E. H. Chapin, D. D. 12mo.

MISCELLANEOUS.

SMITH ON DIVINE GOVERNMENT. By T. Southwood Smith, M. D. 12mo. 374 pages. Price $1.25.

ROGERS' PRO AND CON OF UNIVERSALISM. By George Rogers. 12mo. 356 pages. Price $1.25.

PAGAN ORIGIN OF PARTIALIST DOCTRINES. By John Claudius Pitrat. 12mo. 246 pages. Price 75 cents.

PSALMS AND HYMNS AND SPIRITUAL SONGS. Compiled for the use of Universalist Churches, Associations, and Social Meetings. Third Edition. 16mo. Cloth, 191 pages. Price $4.50 per dozen.

BROOKS' PRACTICAL POWER OF UNIVERSALISM. In a Series of Discourses. By Elbridge Gerry Brooks. 12mo. 350 pages. Price $1.25.

ELY AND THOMAS' THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION on Universalism and Endless Punishment. 18mo. 288 pages. Price 65 cents.

BALCH'S CLASS BOOK. A Class Book for Sunday Schools. By Rev. W. S. Balch. Price $1.25 per dozen.

JUVENILES.

THE MERCHANT'S WIDOW. By Mrs. C. M. Sawyer. 18mo. Gilt back. Price 60 cents.

LOUISA MURRAY. By Mrs. F. M. Baker. 18 mo. Gilt back. Price 60 cts.

THE FLOWER BASKET. Translated from the German. By. T. J. Sawyer, D. D. 18 mo. Gilt back. Price 60 cents.

QUEEN LOVE AND THE FARIES. 18mo. Price 35 cents.

BEECHDALE. By Kate Carlton. 18mo. Price 60 cents.

Also on hand, and for sale as above, wholesale and retail,

ALL THE UNIVERSALIST BOOKS IN THE MARKET,

Including Class Books, Catechisms, and all Instruction Books for our Sunday Schools.

JUVENILE BOOKS,

Suitable for Universalist Sunday School Libraries,

Constantly on hand in quantities sufficient to meet the wants of our Western Schools. Great care is exercised in the selection of these books, and all orders will be filled at a discount of Twenty-five per cent. from retail price.

Societies or individuals sending their orders as above, may depend on receiving their books at the very lowest prices, with the privilege of exchanging such as may not suit them. Address all orders,

WILLIAMSON & CANTWELL, Cin. O.

THE STAR IN THE WEST,

A LARGE QUARTO WEEKLY UNIVERSALIST PAPER. Published by WILLIAMSON & CANTWELL, Cin., O. $2.50 a year in advance.

THE NEW COVENANT;

A Large Weekly Universalist Paper.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Edited by D. P. and MARY A. LIVERMORE.

This is one of the largest and best Universalist papers in the denomination, having a very able corps of regular Contributers, among whom are Revs. W. S. Balch, Sumner Ellis, J. W. Hanson, H. R. Nye, J. S. Dennis, C. F. LeFevre, Mary Safford and many others.

On the 1st of January, the New Covenant will be much enlarged and improved. It will be issued in quarto form, and be larger than any Universalist paper now in existence. Mrs. Livermore will then commence a serial story, of great interest, which will be continued through the greater portion of the year. Price $2.50 per year.

D. P. LIVERMORE,
CHICAGO, ILL.

BOOKS! BOOKS!! BOOKS!!!

A large assortment of Universalist and Sunday School Books, constantly on hand at the New Covenant Office, Chicago, Ill.

All cash orders will be promptly filled, at the lowest price of the market This establishment has been in existence for nearly twenty years, and we solicit the patronage of the Universalist public.

D. P. LIVERMORE,
CHICAGO, ILL.

PROOF-TEXTS

Of Endless Punishment Explained.

384 PAGES.

By D. P. Livermore, Chicago, Ill.

This is an invaluable book, containing a careful examination of all the texts quoted to prove the doctrine of endless punishment: such as: "The wicked shall be turned into hell." "In hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." "Our God is a consuming fire."

This is the only book that carefully considers the case of the murderer and suicide, showing how they are punished and saved.

Price $1.25. Postage (20) added when sent by mail. For sale at New Covenant Office, Chicago.

D. P. LIVERMORE,
CHICAGO, ILL.